

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XVI

JANUARY, 1945

No. 1

Foreword

Again a new year has dawned, and it is clear that 1944 was not the year destined to bring the final cataclysm, the end of the present universe, but that God's mercy once more deferred the advent of Judgment Day, giving sinners another opportunity to repent and saints some more time to show their gratitude to the Savior by spreading His kingdom. It is a topsy-turvy, confused, suffering, disintegrating world on which January, 1945, descends. How can one view it without becoming sarcastic: a world vaunting itself as having attained unheard-of heights of wisdom and yet striving with might and main to make its own house collapse. It is like a super-giant, a global Goliath, who sits in solemn state with cap and gown, diplomas of high intellectual and other achievements all about him, but who with a huge blade cuts away one limb after the other from his body and now and then deftly stabs himself — the blood is gushing forth, and a moribund look is spreading over his features. Oh, these clever statesmen! Madness arises somewhere among the nations, and the only answer and remedy the wise leaders and doctors have for it is some more madness. "*Similia similibus curantur* — don't you see?"

Through God's mercy the war, we trust, will be ended in the not too distant future. What kind of world will it be that will then emerge and take shape? If discussions and achievement were in the same ratio, it ought to be a nearly perfect world, because there is nothing that is talked and written about so persistently as postwar problems and conditions. Naturally our readers and we are interested in the role which the Church is to play in the *post-bellum* reconstruction work. In some quarters the view is urged that at the peace table the Church should be represented to see to it that in the treaties the principles of the Sermon on the Mount are recognized and followed. One church leader who we have no

doubt would very much like to be present or represented in those negotiations is the *pontifex maximus* of Rome. How it would flatter his vanity and nurture his pretensions (rather unsuccessfully maintained during the present sitting-on-the-fence period) to be invited to participate in the important debates and parleys which will usher in the peace stipulations! Among Protestants the presence of representatives of the Church at the peace table has been both advocated and opposed. We agree with those who sternly frown on any attempt of the Church to be a participant as a Church in the peace negotiations. While we devoutly pray that the men responsible for the drawing up of the peace treaties may be Christians, who do their work in the fear of God and in the light of the Holy Scriptures, we hold that the Church as such has neither the right to engage in such activities nor the competence for them. The Church is the body of believers in Jesus Christ, it has an infallible Guide—the Word of God. Wherever this Guide speaks, it can speak with authority. Where this Guide is silent, it has to be silent, too, unless it is willing to stultify itself. Does the Bible say whether Germany is to be dismembered, whether Japan is to be shorn of all foreign possessions, whether the Balkan states are to be left intact?! Why, then, clamor for representation of the Church at the peace parleys? That there may be some ministers of the Gospel who possess striking political insight and acumen, we are ready to admit. But that is due to their own personal endowments and not to their being spokesmen of the Church. If only at this juncture all who have been called to be ministers of Christ would keep Is. 1:18-20 uppermost in their mind: "Come now, and let us reason together, saith the Lord: though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they shall be as wool. If ye be willing and obedient, ye shall eat the good of the land; but if ye refuse and rebel, ye shall be devoured with the sword: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it!"

Some Protestant leaders think they have found a fairly sure panacea for all the ills besetting the world—the nationalistic animosities, the economic troubles, the class conflicts, the strife between capital and labor, the race prejudices, the crime waves, and the other troubles from which the whole family of nations, collectively and individually, is suffering. It is a simple remedy and consists merely in the unification of the churches. How often do we not hear the slogan "In union there is strength"! Bible texts are quoted which inculcate the principle of peace and harmony among Christians. Christianity, we are told, overcame the many social evils in the old Roman empire, such as slavery, execution by crucifixion, the gladiatorial contests, the unworthy position of women, the neglect of the sick and the poor, and it can do the

same thing for our world, provided Christians stand united and unselfishly work for the same goals. It is an intriguing propaganda which is carried on by these prophets of peace. Who is so glacier-like in his sympathies as not to be moved by its appeals? Several things will have to be granted at once: the divided state of Christendom is not according to God's will; the spectacle of war between Christians and Christian bodies is not a factor that will dispose an outsider favorably to Christianity; much of the strength and time that go into controversy could be used to better advantage.

In view of these and other considerations, we say that if the knights of peace and amity can unite the churches in the right way, on a Scriptural basis, the basis God Himself has indicated, we shall all applaud. It is not mere cant, but an expression of our heart's sentiment when we declare that all of us engaged in editing and publishing the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* are intensely interested in seeing true harmony established between the Christian denominations. But what is attempted in this direction, for instance, in the Federal Council of Churches, is the formation of a united front through indifference toward individual and distinctive doctrines, a *laissez faire* policy in matters of teachings, every church being permitted to cling to what in the eyes of the others are heresies and errors, provided it accepts a few general principles and is not insisting on adoption by all of its own particular creed. It means that efforts are made to bring the churches together, not by removal of their doctrinal differences, but in spite of doctrinal differences, the separating barriers being simply ignored. What of the truth? It is compelled to walk arm in arm with error. Of course, everybody is told he may cling to his convictions, but he must not protest if what he holds dear, precious, and holy is trampled under foot by a fellow member in the union. What of the Scripture passages which inculcate separation from heretics? They are either not considered as normative and binding for us in the twentieth century, or they are regarded as not pertaining to the question of fellowship between individuals and churches clinging to the name "Christian."

With such tactics, which amount to a denial of the truth and unfaithfulness to God's holy Word, we can have nothing to do. It is our conviction that in the Scriptures God speaks to us, that every teaching, every word of it is divine, and that in its statements we are not dealing with conjectures or opinions, but with sacred truths which must be dearer to us than life itself, and which we cannot permit to be treated with indifference. Indeed, union based on true unity would be a most desirable boon; but the union sought after by the union-at-any-price propagandists would be positively dis-

astrous. Instead of being a panacea, it would be a poison, killing all spiritual life.

This brings us to the topic of the attempts made in our country to establish Lutheran unity and union. Much of what is said and written on this topic we consider not only ill advised, but positively wrong, because it disregards the truth that God's Word must be our Guide in all matters of religion and conscience, and that the chief factors to be regarded are not considerations of convenience or expediency, but the principles laid down in the Holy Scriptures. We must beware of approaching the question of Lutheran union in the manner of the unscrupulous politician who on a given issue balances the advantages against the disadvantages and makes his decision without any thought of the right or wrong involved. But though we protest against the attitude which refuses to give serious examination to the doctrinal issues arising here or to God's directives, the cause of Lutheran unity is very dear to us. Let it be promoted, but let it be promoted in the right way.

Since in 1945 Lutheran unity will be a prominent subject of discussion in Lutheran circles, a word or two of a general nature will not be considered out of place. To begin with, let us emphasize that the excess of enthusiasm and the erroneous argumentation met with here and there where Lutheran union is sponsored, must not induce us to go to the extreme of viewing with suspicion and alarm all attempts to bring about Lutheran unification. *Abusus non tollit usum*. If a thing is right, its being sponsored among others by some cranks does not make it wrong. The plenary inspiration of the Scriptures does not become objectionable because among its champions we find millenarians, Jehovah's Witnesses, and Holy Rollers.

A chief requirement, if the negotiations are to succeed, is that of humble love for our fellow Lutherans. In the spirit of helpfulness, which, however, does not forget or overlook our own frailties and shortcomings, the task must be approached. It is true that there is a love which outranks the love of our fellow men — the love we owe our great God, our Father in heaven. "We should fear, love, and trust in God above all things." Certainly nothing must be done which would give second place to the love we owe our Creator. But are the two loves which constitute the sum of the Commandments in conflict with each other? Far from it. The one is the steppingstone to the other. Where the major is found, the minor will not be absent. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he that loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God, whom he hath not seen?" 1 John 4:20.

It is a truism that in drawing up conditions of fellowship the "too little" and the "too much" have to be avoided. On account of the spirit of the times it is evident that we have to guard especially against the "too little." We are living in days of doctrinal and moral laxity; the philosophy of pragmatism has captivated the minds: "Take the course that works!" But it cannot be denied that in opposing the popular latitudinarianism the danger of our insisting on "too much" gets to be very real, too. Extremes beget extremes.

There is before the Lutheran Church in America in general and before the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod in particular a document which, it is hoped, will form the doctrinal basis for church fellowship between the two bodies mentioned — the *Doctrinal Affirmation* of the Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio, and Other States, and the American Lutheran Church. Both bodies have requested their members to give this document careful study in order to determine whether it is Scripturally adequate. God granting His grace, the circle may become enlarged, and other Lutherans may become interested in the document, too. As it is studied and examined, we beg the brethren to bear in mind the general principles set down above. It is not a panacea we are seeking; that will be provided for God's children when Christ on Judgment Day takes them home into the mansions of His Father's house. But adoption of the *Affirmation*, if it is found acceptable, may prove of some help in the efforts we together with all other conservative Lutherans are putting forth to bring the message of Christ's redemption to a perishing world.

W. ARNDT

The Sola Scriptura and Its Modern Antithesis

I

It is indeed correct to say that the outstanding achievement of Luther's Reformation was the recovery, clarification, and vindication of the *sola gratia* (*sola fide*). That truly was a pre-eminent accomplishment, an almost miraculous attainment, as it appears to everyone who considers how thoroughly Rome had succeeded in burying this *articulus omnium fundamentalissimus* under the rubbish of its extreme work-righteousness program.¹⁾ Luther in a most lucid manner, in learned treatises (*De Servo Arbitrio*), in sermons, intelligible to the simplest layman, and in songs made known far and wide the Gospel message of God's free and full grace

1) Cf. *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Die Lehre Luthers). Von Reinhold Seeberg. Vierter Band, erste Abteilung, pp. 124 ff. Also *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*. Von Wilh. Walther, pp. 363 ff.

in Christ Jesus as it had never been proclaimed since the time of the Apostles, not even by St. Augustine.²⁾

Nevertheless, the *sola gratia* was not the only accomplishment of the Reformation. There was another that is equally necessary for the salvation of sinners. The *sola gratia* is a divine doctrine set forth in Holy Scripture, and only there, never in any man-made book of religion.³⁾ That God-given Holy Scripture of the Prophets and Apostles, on which the Church of Christ is built,⁴⁾ not even Rome with all its trickery and power could destroy.⁵⁾ But Rome could so deeply inter it beneath *Summae* and *Sententiae* and could so securely hedge it in by Apocrypha and decretals, decisions of Popes and councils, and traditions in general that Scripture no longer meant anything in Christendom as the source and norm of the Christian faith and life. Rome wanted to do away with the *principium materiale* (*sola gratia*) of the Christian Church; to accomplish this, it had to get out of the way its *principium formale*, Scripture as the sole *principium cognoscendi*. Luther restored to Christendom the *sola Scriptura*, the Bible as the only source and rule of faith.

What did the *sola Scriptura* mean to Luther and his co-workers? It is, we believe, the last and crowning work of Dr. Michael Reu that he sacrificed, so to speak, the last ounce of his strength to witness, not only to international Lutheranism but also to the entire world, that to Luther and all Gnesio-Lutherans the *sola Scriptura* meant verbal inspiration, plenary inspiration, the sole authority of Christian doctrine and conduct, and that not merely for a short time, while Luther was "*der junge Luther*," but "until the end of his life," the infallible Book of God, inerrant "even in those parts that do not concern our salvation," although this absolute inerrancy belonged "only to the original drafts of the Biblical books." All this Luther and his followers believed and taught without, however, acknowledging a "mechanical or dictated inspiration," for "not Luther but other Lutheran theologians of his time were on the road to the mechanical theory of inspiration."

These statements, largely taken from the chapter titles of Dr. Reu's great confessional book, point out with sufficient clearness what the theologians of the Reformation meant by *sola Scriptura*. The writer does not agree with everything that is stated in Dr. Reu's book. To him, for example, it does not appear as proved that "the later dogmatists either entirely or to a great extent excluded

2) For quick orientation consult Chr. Ernst Luthardts *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, 13. Auflage, voellig umgearbeitet und ergaenzt von Robert Jelke, pp. 219 ff.

3) Cf. 1 Cor. 2:7 ff.

4) Eph. 2:20.

5) Matt. 24:35.

such co-operation," i. e., between the holy writers and the Holy Spirit, regarding inspiration as purely mechanical or dictational.⁶⁾ Dr. Reu himself suggests this when in Note 187 he writes among other things: "It is true, it was wrong when Luthardt wrote concerning the teaching of the dogmaticians of the seventeenth century: 'Das Verhaeltnis des Heiligen Geistes zur Schrift ist [by these dogmaticians] nicht durch die eigene geistige Aktivitaet der biblischen Schriftsteller, sondern nur aeusserlich durch die Hand der Schreibenden vermittelt gedacht.' . . . They really advocated more and emphasized the fact that the holy writers, instead of being dead, unknowing and unwilling tools in the hands of the Holy Spirit, were knowing and willing instruments. . . . If Church Fathers, or some dogmaticians of our own Church, called the human authors *notarii*, *calami*, *amanuenses*, *instrumenta*, this is by no means to be considered wrong in every respect. It is wrong only if one, by the use of these terms, degrades them to merely mechanical instruments or machines who wrote without participation of their soul life. It is correct and an expression of a Biblical truth if these terms are used merely to designate human instrumentality without any definition of the latter."⁷⁾

The writer regards this as a remarkable proof of Dr. Reu's honesty and sincerity. Dr. Reu evidently held that there were later dogmaticians who believed in a mechanical inspiration by mere dictation; yet he is fair to them and so frankly publishes what later theologians said in opposition to a "mechanical inspiration." To this end also he quotes Quenstedt's remark in explanation of *περόμενοι* in 2 Pet. 1:21, which affirms, among other things, that the holy writers "did not write beyond and against their will, or unconsciously and reluctantly, but of their own accord, with willingness and knowing what they wrote."⁸⁾ Dr. Reu's timely testimony will prove a blessing to many who are ill informed on the subject or who, moved by the untruths or half-truths of the opponents of the *sola Scriptura*, are inclined to view the formal principle of the Reformation with doubt and suspicion, yes, perhaps with downright repugnance and opposition. As Dr. Reu rightly shows, the *sola Scriptura* meant to the theologians of the Reformation just exactly what the Formula of Concord declares: "First [then we receive and embrace with our whole heart] the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the pure,

6) Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures*, p. 114 f.

7) Reu, *Luther and the Scriptures*, p. 166 f.

8) Note 187. Cf. also *Christian Dogmatics*, p. 103 ff. Note likewise the caution there given that such terms as "penmen," "amanuenses," "scribes," and "notaries" are "used correctly as long as the *tertium comparationis* in these figures of speech is strictly kept in view." *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

clear fountain of Israel, which is the only true standard by which all teachers and doctrines are to be judged." ⁹⁾

It may be well here to stress that to Luther and his co-workers the Bible was a book, a *written record*, divinely inspired and infallibly dependable in all its statements. What the Bible says, from Genesis to Revelation, was to them God's true Word. In Scripture, God Himself spoke to them, and He spoke by the very words and declarations of Scripture, because those words and declarations were to them divine words and declarations. Luther thus writes: "Scripture should be understood as the words declare" (St. L. ed., III:21); again: "Whatever Scripture says I will not permit my reason to criticize, but I believe it with simple faith" (St. L. ed., XIII:1909); again: "Carnal reason creates heresies and errors. Faith teaches and holds to the truth, for it cleaves to Scripture, which never lies or deceives" (St. L. ed., XI:162). In the chapter "Scriptures Become the Sole Authority to Luther" Dr. Reu, quoting Luther, writes: "Nothing should be presented which is not affirmed by the authority of both Testaments and agrees with them. It cannot be otherwise, for the Scriptures are divine; in them God speaks, and they are His Word." Again: "In his lectures on the Psalms, Luther regards the expressions 'God speaks' and 'the Scriptures speak,' as convertible. To hear or to read the Scriptures is nothing else than to hear God. They are His sanctuary in which He is present. Therefore we dare not despise one single word of the Scripture for 'all its words are weighed, counted, and measured.'" ¹⁰⁾

Dr. Seeberg writes in connection with what the *sola Scriptura* meant to Luther: "Der Gedanke der absoluten Autoritaet der Schrift findet bei Luther . . . seinen Abschluss in der *Inspiration* der Heiligen Schrift. Die Worte der Schrift sind wirkliche Gottesworte, denn der Heilige Geist hat seine Weisheit und Geheimnis 'in das Wort gefasst und in der Schrift offenbart,' daher entscheide das *offenbarliche eusserliche wort* (W., 36, 501). Der wahrhaftige Gott redet in der Schrift; daher soll man das schlicht annehmen, was in ihr steht (40. 2, 593). Was etwa Paulus sagt, sagt der Heilige Geist; also geht wider den Geist, was wider Pauli Wort geht (W., 10. 2, 139 f.). . . . Daher ist die Schrift Gottes- und nicht Menschenwort (W., 5, 184; 8, 597). Und mehr: Gott ist der *auctor evangelii* (W., 8, 584), und der Heilige Geist selbst ist der Verfasser der Genesis (W., 44, 532). Die Bibel ist *eygen schrift des Geistes* (W., 7, 638; 46, 545; 47, 133; E., 52, 321. 333)." ¹¹⁾

9) *Concordia Triglotta*, p. 851.

10) *Op. cit.*, p. 19 ff.

11) *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte* (Die Lehre Luthers); IV/1, p. 414.

II

To this doctrine of the *sola Scriptura* modern unbelief stands in sharp antithesis. By unbelief we here understand corrupt reason's refusal to accept Holy Scripture as God's inspired, inerrant Word, the only source and norm of the Christian faith and life. In the opposition of human reason to accept the *sola Scriptura* we of course must reckon with degrees. Dyed-in-the-wool, back-leaning, reactionary Modernism still takes the lead among those who reject Scripture. Then there is Neo-Thomism, which goes back to the basic philosophical principles of Thomas Aquinas and seeks in his principle of *revelatio et ratio* the essence of truth.¹²⁾ The last, Barthianism, or, as it is also called, the Dialectical Theology, is the most popular and at present perhaps most subtle theological error, with both a left and a right wing, the latter right now making itself very strongly felt in Lutheran circles in America. All these streams of rationalistic thought oppose the doctrine that Holy Scripture is God's inspired and infallible Word and therefore the only source and norm of the Christian faith and life, though they differ in the manner and measure of their opposition. Very rightly Dr. Theodore Engelder in his well-known book *Reason or Revelation?* writes: "The majority of the Lutheran theologians of today, inclusive of the Conservatives, denies Verbal, Plenary Inspiration, and denies it on the ground that it is an undesirable doctrine."¹³⁾ In the same vein Dr. Engelder writes in his more recent and comprehensive volume *Scripture Cannot be Broken*, no doubt, the keenest analysis of the subject and the most exhaustive reply to the objectors to Verbal Inspiration: "The moderns abhor and detest Verbal Inspiration, and they are not at all backward about telling us why they cannot accept it with a good conscience. They offer a great variety of reasons why the Church should get rid of it as soon as possible." To this he adds the note, "When the moderns denounce 'the theory of inspiration by dictation,' 'the mechanical theory,' they have in mind, as will be shown later on, the doctrine of Verbal Inspiration."¹⁴⁾

12) Cf. *Present Theological Tendencies*, by E. E. Aubrey, for brief but satisfactory characterizations of the three major trends in theological thought: Neo-Thomism, Barthianism, and Modernism.

13) Cf. p. 122. Note also Dr. Engelder's remark: "Indeed, it is a life-and-death struggle. Reason must die or faith dies. . . . *Ratio inimica fidei*. . . . *Nos occidimus rationem*, p. 175 f.

14) *Scripture Cannot be Broken*, p. 6. — Both books of Dr. Engelder should be read by every pastor, teacher, and intelligent layman, for the doctrine of Scripture is at present the battleground of theological dispute, and it may very easily prove the Waterloo of Christian orthodoxy in our country. Let congregations or societies see to it that both books be acquired forthwith for school, parish, and Sunday-school libraries.

A. Modernism and the Sola Scriptura

So far as Modernism is concerned, nothing but the fiercest onslaughts on the authority of Holy Scripture can be expected; it is almost nauseous in its blasphemous irreligiousness.¹⁵⁾ Extreme Modernism at present is a trifle out of date, for the pendulum of religious thought has swung back toward the right, and people in general yawn rather than that they are horrified at modernistic eruptions. But still we must figure with its opposition to the *sola Scriptura*.

We scrutinize a few works of Modernists at random. There is, for example, the much-read work *The Eternal Gospel* by Rufus M. Jones. The book bears a beautiful, intriguing, yet misleading title; what Rufus Jones means by the "eternal Gospel" is not the Gospel of the New Testament but "the endless revelation to men of a spiritual Reality, who is over all and in all" (p. 7). What Dr. Jones advocates is hardly more than pagan naturalism disguised, of course, after the fashion of Schleiermacher, in Christian terminology. Or take W. M. Horton's *Theology in Transition*. In the "realistic theology" which he presents, he perceives the "eternal Gospel" in the simple Quaker statement of James Naylor that it is man's supreme duty to do good and refrain from evil.¹⁶⁾ Neither Jones nor Horton ultimately has any need of the Bible at all; the simple ethical creed of the Buddhist is to them enough "eternal Gospel"; for to them the term Gospel does not denote what God in Christ Jesus has done for the salvation of the world, but rather what man does in the service of God for his neighbor. Charles Clayton Morrison in his work *What Is Christianity?* says: "Not the Bible, but the living Church, the body of Christ, is the true Word of God. . . . The Word of God is the actual creative working of God in a specific order of human community in which He has revealed Himself in history" (p. 208), which means that in the end there is no need of Scripture at all, and which only represents a new form of Protestant Romanism.¹⁷⁾

15) Cf. John Horsch, *Modern Religious Liberalism*, which is still worth reading, though it does not take into consideration the latest excrescences of modernistic atheism.

16) Cf. the whole quotation in its context, p. 170 ff.

17) The reader will find all these works well worth studying, and as he does so, he will become the more convinced that Modernism is ultimately nothing else than an endeavor to supplant God's Word and put in its place man's own speculation. Consider, for example, such statements of Morrison: "The Bible is not the revelation; it is ancillary to the revelation" (p. 168); or: "If the Bible judges the Church, the Church also judges the Bible" (*ibid.*); or: "The divine revelation is not in the book, but in history" (*ibid.*); or: "God's revelation does not consist of any absolute deposit of truth" (p. 60). Here indeed is total rejection of Scripture as the divine authority in religion. To Morrison the Christian doctrine is no more than a human construct.

In *Liberal Theology: An Appraisal* (essays in honor of E. W. Lyman) Henry Sloane Coffin, in his contribution on "The Scriptures," declares that "no man can pronounce a book without error unless he claims omniscience for himself, and verbal inspiration cannot be asserted of a collection of writings which frequently contain divergent accounts of the same incident or utterance" (by the way a very ancient, outmoded, and unfair accusation).¹⁸ In the same book D. C. Macintosh, in his essay on "Eternal Life," declares that "conservative Christianity will be better served in the long run by the methods characteristic of the scholarship and theology of Liberalism than by those habitually employed in the older tradition of literalistic biblicism" (p. 240). In this connection he bitterly attacks the inerrancy, verbal inspiration, and authority of Holy Scripture. Much in line with Coffin and Macintosh is H. F. Rall, whose *Christianity: an Inquiry into Its Nature and Truth*, won him the \$15,000 Bross Award. But the theology which Rall offers in his book is not worth the award, for the theology which he represents is not that of St. Paul or St. John, but that of a liberal who deposes the Bible and does away with genuine Christianity. He cautions his readers against the danger "that within the Church, men shall claim for Scripture or creed or the empirical Church herself that finality and absolute authority which belong only to God Himself" (p. VIII). It fills him with alarm that "to the right are others who realize the crucial matter in religion is faith in God, but in their defense of that faith tend to fall back upon traditional supernaturalism and authoritarianism" (p. VII). Rall thus repudiates the whole Christian doctrine and says: "Today we must be scientific and strictly empirical, and that means beginning at scratch, without any assumption whatever" (p. IX) — a thing, however, which Rall does not do, for his theology is a combination of "empirical" elements taken from Schleiermacher, Ritschl, Troeltsch, Barth, Fosdick, etc., with very little originality, constructive thought, and helpful suggestion, but with total rejection of the *differentia specifica* of the Christian religion.

In *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought*, A. C. Knudson inveighs against those who look upon the Bible as a "body of absolute truth, as a kind of 'paper pope,' to which human reason must submit" (p. 112); and he suggests that "the Bible to win the modern mind must itself become modern" (p. 113). This was rendered difficult "by the Reformers' insistence on Verbal Inspiration," which as Dean Inge says, is "the great weakness of Protestantism." Fortunately this weakness, Knudson believes, can be remedied; and

18) P. 334 f. One must read the entire essay to realize fully how very little Scripture means to a Modernist of the type of Coffin.

to remedy this, he wrote his book, in which every Christian doctrine is ultimately denied.¹⁹⁾

In Sweden, Nathan Soederblom, some years ago, published *The Nature of Revelation*, which in 1933 appeared in America in an English translation and has enjoyed considerable popularity among Liberals in our country. He expounds and stresses in this book God's continued revelation. "God's continuing revelation is in men, in history" (p. 178). Soederblom, of course, does not desire to see the Bible abolished entirely, but he writes: "It must not be forgotten that the chief lesson of the Bible itself [how these Modernists counterfeit!] is that God is a living God and has not grown aged or less active now than in his younger days" (p. 179). So God speaks through Cyrus, the pagan ruler, Moses, Zoroaster, Troeltsch, Soederblom, and all the Modernists who have published books ever since Soederblom's death. Only what these men believe and confess is not the *satisfactio vicaria* or the *sola gratia*, but mere ethical speculation, salvation by good works, social improvement, and the like.²⁰⁾

To the modernistic works on religion belongs, too, A. Campbell Garnett's *A Realistic Philosophy of Religion*. Garnett does not even bother with the Bible; he ignores it; but he says some very interesting modernistic things, — among these that "there are limits of God to control human behavior and the physical world" (p. 295), which means a finite God, who in reality is not God at all; that "sin is spiritual inertia, the lack of attention to moral values" (p. 311); and that God has revealed Himself with "peculiar force and clarity" "in the life and teaching of a succession of religious leaders who gradually developed more and more fully the ideal of a universal good" (p. 320). Garnett admits that God's self-revelation has culminated in the person of Jesus Christ, who "thus becomes the cen-

19) Cf. p. 302 f. Knudson's book is somewhat obsolete (1925), as modernistic books go, but it is still worth studying, since the author enunciates principles that are bound to endure for all times because they please the Old Adam.

20) Modernists, of course, are not all alike; each endeavors to present the old unbelief from a different viewpoint, and that is why their books are published and read. Some of them have been influenced by the Barthian movement and, by a sort of religious eclecticism, weave Barthian and other theological principles into new patterns. We recommend to the reader for orientation such books as *Types of Modern Theology*, by H. R. Mackintosh; *Present Theological Tendencies*, by E. E. Aubrey; and similar helpful characterizations of modern liberal trends. But by this time he may be so utterly confused that it might be well for him to reorient himself to the Christian faith by the study of such works as *Revelation and Inspiration*, by B. B. Warfield; *Scripture Cannot be Broken*, by Theodore Engelder, and similar orthodox works.

tral figure of society" (p. 320); but the Christ of Garnett is not the Christ of St. Paul, not the divine-human Savior, who by His vicarious atonement became the world's Redeemer, Garnett's Christ is Harnack's Christ, a purely human Christ.

This year there was published a symposium under the title *Protestantism*, whose editor was W. K. Anderson and whose publisher is the Commission on Courses of Study of the Methodist Church (Nashville, Tenn.). The book (among other things) contains twelve essays on subjects related to Protestantism: one by J. T. McNeil ("Was the Reformation Needed?"), another by A. R. Wentz ("Luther and His Tradition"), a third by Georgia Harkness ("Calvin and His Tradition"), and so forth. The writer was chiefly interested in two contributions, entitled "Interpretations," one by A. C. Knudson ("Cardinal Principles of the Reformation") and another by W. G. Chanter ("Protestantism and the Bible"). In "Cardinal Principles of Protestantism" Knudson writes (among other things): "The cardinal principle of Protestantism which I place third in the list is the supreme authority of Scripture. This doctrine was for a time regarded as the basic principle of Protestantism, as the foundation on which the whole structure of its teaching rests. The Bible was held to be the one infallible source and ground of religious belief. But this point of view now belongs largely to the past. It has succumbed to the modern theory of knowledge and to modern Biblical criticism. . . . Since then it has become increasingly clear to thoughtful people that religious faith does not need either an infallible Book or an infallible Church to establish its validity. It validates itself" (p. 132 f.). In "Protestantism and the Bible" Dr. Chanter writes: "The essence of Protestantism cannot be contained within the covers of any book, even though that book is the Bible. After all, it was not in the rediscovery of the Bible that Protestantism was born, but in the recapture of a great experience." (P. 138.) Again: "To the Reformers the Bible was primarily a book of power and not a compendium of ideas about God, a source book for a complex theology. This conception was certainly not new with them. St. Paul, who knew that the letter kills, knew of a word that was power, that came with the demonstration of the Spirit." (P. 142.) How blind these Modernists are! How ungratefully and perversely they reject the Word of God! Today the Bible is being spread in millions of copies and millions of persons are reading it as the divine Word of Truth, as God's own inspired, inerrant Book, and here come learned men—professors of theology, editors, ministers—and heap more disgrace on the Bible than scoffing Voltaire did in his day, for they are dynamiting the foundation on which the Christian faith rests.

B. Neo-Thomism and the Sola Scriptura

No wonder Romanism is aggressive today, as it never was before since the days of the Counter Reformation. In the atheism of renegade Protestantism, Rome sees its opportunity to reconquer Christendom for the Papacy. One of its weapons of offense is Neo-Thomism, by which it pits the authority of St. Thomas Aquinas against individual "authorities" who, having rejected Scripture and destroyed its influence, assert that their own subjective views are authoritative in religion. Against these blustering Modernists, who rage against orthodox Christianity, Rome has a strong case. Of course, Rome itself fights these rationalists with rationalism, not with Scripture. Neo-Thomism is essentially a philosophy, not a theology. Substantially, too, it is rationalistic in its whole epistemological approach. But Rome is old, while Modernism is relatively new. Rome is organized, while present-day Modernists are fighting one another. Again, Rome has a church dogma, which its adherents dare not ignore; they may philosophize only within the scope of the established church dogma, by which they feel themselves held together as the *una sancta ecclesia*.

Nevertheless modernistic rationalism has much in common with Romanistic rationalism. In *Revelation*, edited by John Baillie and Hugh Martin (containing essays by Aulén, Barth, Bulgakoff, D'Arcy, Eliot, Horton, and Wm. Temple), much is written that even the Neo-Thomist might accept as true. When Barth, for example, writes that "Holy Scripture as such is not the revelation" (p. 67); or when Bulgakoff says: "'Inspiration' in general is only one particular form of revelation" (p. 154); or when Horton affirms: "We are not likely again to identify God's eternal Word with the Book which contains the record of its revealing, or to insist that everything in that Book is infallibly correct and verbally inspired" (p. 264), Thomists, though perhaps taking the words in a different sense, might support them. Thomists may even nod assent when G. P. Mains in his *Divine Inspiration* says: "The Bible stands, and will forever hold its place, as the supreme literary record of the highest experiences of elect souls in their direct realization of God. . . . But it may not be forgotten that at best, of these supreme experiences, the Bible is only a literary record. It is an accommodative attempt to portray through letters to the human understanding, to fuse into the human moral feeling, mountain-height experiences had in hours when in great and seeing souls there have arisen the most luminous revelations of God" (p. 97 f.); for, after all, the Thomist recognizes Scripture only as a *norma secundaria* or a *norma remissiva*. So, when in his *Meaning of Revelation* H. Richard Niebuhr criticizes the orthodox theologians for "identifying revelation with Scriptures" (p. 75) or for "equating Scriptures with

revelation" (p. 49), that, too, might receive a passing mark with the Thomist professor. So also much of what is said in K. E. Kirk's *The Study of Theology*, especially that which regards the Reformation (pp. 16, 85, 195 f., 305 ff., 324 ff.), would perhaps more than delight the Thomist of today; for both the Modernist and the Thomist think along rationalistic lines. And yet the Thomists are bound to fight the Modernists, not merely because they are *extra ecclesiam* but because in their speculations they go beyond all measure of what is sane in rationalization and lose themselves in utter antitheism and atheism. There is no doubt that Modernism is paving the way to Rome for many among the world's intelligentsia, who are thoroughly disgusted with the vanities of present-day modernistic systems of religious thought.

Thomism substantially holds that "grace builds on what is best in human nature, and faith is reasonable," as R. G. Bandas puts it in his *Contemporary Philosophy and Thomistic Principles* (p. 12). Summarizing the essence of Thomism, this writer declares: "In this lies the whole secret of Thomism, in this immense effort of intellectual honesty to reconstruct philosophy on a plan which exhibits the *de facto* accord with theology as the necessary consequence of the demands of Reason itself, and not as the accidental result of a mere wish for conciliation." (*Op. cit.*, p. 13.) Thomism, thus representing the blending of *revelatio et ratio*, needs must be rationalistic, but in that very fact also is centered its opposition to the *sola Scriptura*.²¹ We are here less interested in Thomism than in Modernism, because the former is not so widely spread as is the latter. But the aggressive activism of Romanism, which essentially is Thomism, will make it ever more necessary for Protestant scholars to acquaint themselves with both the essence and the objective of Thomism. Suffice it to say that also Thomism because of its ingrained rationalistic tendency cannot tolerate the *sola Scriptura*. In Protestant countries Rome urges the spread of the Bible, but this does not mean that Rome today regards the Bible in the same way as does orthodox Protestantism. In the Roman Catholic Church the Bible will forever remain a secondary norm.

C. Barthianism and the Sola Scriptura

Barthianism in a way has made Bible study very popular, since it sees in the Bible one of the "means of divine-human communication." But Barthianism, too, rejects the *sola Scriptura*, and that with no less emphasis than does Modernism and Thomism, just

21) Besides the book just mentioned the reader may study the chapter on Neo-Thomism in Aubrey's *Present Theological Tendencies* and the more recent book *The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas*, by Hans Meyer, tr. by Frederic Eckhoff.

because also Barthianism is essentially rationalistic. In other words, the Neo-Orthodoxy, as which Barthianism is sometimes known, is not Christian orthodoxy at all but a radical departure from the traditional Christianity in its fundamental problem concerning the source and norm of faith and life.²²⁾

Barthianism today is divided into two wings, one moving toward Modernism and the other to a quasi orthodoxy; both wings oppose the Lutheran principle of the *sola Scriptura* and reject it not only as worthless but also as harmful to the cause of Christian doctrine.

One of the most popular Barthians is Emil Brunner, whose stay at Princeton as guest professor and whose work in English have given him a wider circle of friends than other Continental Barthians have enjoyed. Liberal Barthianism may therefore well be judged by what Brunner has written regarding the *sola Scriptura*. In his well-received book *The Word and the World* he has this to say regarding the *Schriftprinzip*: "As a matter of fact, the book [the Bible] does not necessarily belong to Christian faith" (p. 88); or: "Orthodoxy has made the Bible an independent divine thing, which just as such, as a *corpus mortuum*, is stamped with divine authority" (p. 92); or: "So far as the orthodox theory of Scripture is concerned, there is no distinction between this and the Indian or Mohammedan belief in their sacred books; the Bible has become a divine oracle" (p. 94); or: "How shall we be able to speak of Bible authority, of the Bible as God's Word, after our critical reason has torn it to pieces in such a fashion and made it like the rest of history?" (p. 99). Brunner, then, does not accept the *sola Scriptura*, but repudiates it as unworthy of modern religious belief.

Very clearly he proves this in his more recent book *The Divine-Human Encounter*. The central thought of this work is, as the translator, A. W. Loos, states in his Preface, that "when God meets man, Christian truth comes into being" (p. 5). We owe it largely to Brunner that many of the obscure Barthian expressions have been somewhat clarified; but by doing so, Brunner has also clarified the moot point that, after all, Barthianism is only a new form of rationalism, i. e., the revolt of human reason against the Word of God as it is set forth in Holy Scripture. Of course, as all other Barthians, so also Brunner uses plenty of sheep's clothing, and often his language so closely approaches Christian orthodoxy that many Christian readers have been deceived by his statements.

22) We shall here not describe Barthianism in detail but refer the reader for particulars to our article on Karl Barth, in Vol. XV, No. 6 (June, 1944), of the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY, to which because of the importance of the matter we appended also a rather large bibliography.

But Brunner does not proclaim the Christian doctrine, Law and Gospel, in the traditional sense; he offers a substitute which intermingles Law and Gospel and leaves the anxious sinner without a clear and substantially anchored message of salvation. How bitterly Brunner hates the *sola Scriptura* in the old Lutheran sense is proved by the following statements: "The Scriptures became a gathering of divine oracles, the essence of divinely revealed doctrine. . . . The temptation could not be withstood to create a system of assurances including the confessional dogma, the notion of verbal inspiration, and the Bible understood as a book of revealed doctrine. The 'paper Pope' stands over against the Pope in Rome; quite unnoticed, the position of dependence on the Word of God is usurped by the appeal of pure doctrine, which in turn is made tantamount to the Word of God" (p. 31 f.); or: "The Bible is as little concerned with objective as with subjective truth" (p. 41); or: "The 'formal principle,' the Word of God, and the 'material principle,' redemption through Jesus Christ or justification by faith alone, are not two but one and the same principle seen in two aspects" (p. 46). This almost senseless statement will become clear to the reader when he considers just what the "Word of God" means to the Barthian. This point, however, we must defer for a later discussion. What we mean to show here is that Barthianism by the very essence of its philosophy cannot tolerate the *sola Scriptura*. It is a new religious Liberalism, which sooner or later is bound to land where atheistic Modernism landed—in the bog of total doctrinal indifference to, and rejection of, the *sola fide*.

Barthianism because of its two-facedness, i. e., its toleration of Liberalism and relative orthodoxy (though not orthodoxy in the sense of Worms and Augsburg), has affected many who up to their Barthian conversion were Modernists, among these H. Wheeler Robinson, who in his book *Redemption and Revelation in the Actuality of History* expounds the *Barthian Gottbegegnung in der Geschichte*, as the title of his book shows. Lack of space does not permit us to quote much of his philosophy, but let the reader contemplate the following: "He [the educated evangelical] cannot take refuge in an impossible theory of verbal inspiration" (p. 180); or: "The doctrine of the supremacy of Scripture, as the only rule of faith and life, has been profoundly affected by literary and historical criticism, and by the comparative study of religions. It is still maintained, but virtually on the ground that the Bible is the source book rather than the textbook of Christian doctrine, the sufficiently accurate record of a religious experience which is normative and authoritative" (p. 179). This means that the Lutheran *sola Scriptura* must go overboard, for it is not itself authoritative, though the human experiences recorded therein are authori-

tative. In other words, not God's Word but human experiences become the authority in religion; what men say counts, not what God says. In *The Hibbert Journal* (Vol. XLI, 1942—1943) a writer clarifies this thought thus: "Christian 'revelation' can be no more than the apprehension in each individual soul of the true law of its being as realized in the light of those verities, as to the nature of God and man himself, that Jesus unveiled, as it were."²³ In *Zwischen den Zeiten* (6. Jahrgang, 1928), Barthian oracle and stand-by, George Merz, in his essay "Zur Frage nach dem rechten Lutherverstaendnis," condemns (as do other writers in that periodical) the *sola Scriptura* as unthinkable and raises the question: "Versteht dann also in diesem Punkt doch die Orthodoxie mit ihrem hanebuechenen Buchstabenglauben Luther recht?" (P. 432.) This question he of course denies and he defends Luther against the narrow belief of orthodox Lutheranism. "Ueberall versteht man hier den Luther als den Verkuendiger der grossen Unmittelbarkeit" (p. 434). This means: Luther did not proclaim the Bible as the *de facto* Word of God, but as the medium by which God, who is the only Word ("Gott ist das Wort"), immediately communicates Himself to man ("Gott aber ist frei." P. 434).

Even so conservative a Barthian as Otto Piper rejects the Lutheran *sola Scriptura*, though in his writings (mostly in the practical field) he avoids everything that is controversial. But in his *Grundlagen der Evangelischen Ethik* (1. Band) he clearly shows his Barthian *Einstellung*. His method, he writes, is neither historical nor biblicistic nor confessional. (Cf. p. XVI.) He conceives as the objective of theology pure doctrine, orthodoxy. But this he does not try to establish by quotations from Scripture, from the Fathers, and from Luther. Theology is the attempt to gain pure doctrine by way of science ("Theologie ist der Versuch, die reine Lehre auf dem Wege der Wissenschaft zu gewinnen"). (Cf. p. XVIII.) But this attempt will land him in the end (unless he should change his theological methodology) in the camp of the Modernists; for *Wissenschaft* (science), as understood in modern theology, is nothing else than the conceited, unbelieving human reason, which refuses to accept the Gospel. It is not by his theological method, but only by the grace of God and so through a fortunate inconsistency that O. Piper still adheres to the Christian faith in a general way. His method certainly is not orthodox. (Cf. *The Sunday School Times*, Sept. 18, 1943, for Piper's attack on the inerrancy and authority of Scripture.) In the *Union Review*, published by the students of Union Theological Seminary (Vol. IV, No. 1; December, 1942), Emil

²³ *Religious Autonomy and Revelation*, p. 303. The writer, R. F. Rynd, is not a Barthian, but there is no great difference between his brand of empiricism and that of the Barthians.

Kraeling in an essay "The Church and the Bible" shows Barthian tendencies in rejecting the *sola Scriptura* as "legalism." According to Kraeling, the Protestant Christian "still believes that the principle of Scriptural authority is right, and that the right kind of Scripture study will set it forth in its true light. The great fallacy in the common view of the authority of Scripture is its legalism" (p. 19). The authority of the Bible, he suggests, must not be believed because of Scripture's own witness to this truth, but because "it is demonstrated through the service it performs" (*ibid.*). In O. Piper's *God in History* the writer contends that "the fact should no longer be denied that, in the first chapters of the Bible, human pre-history is narrated in mythical language" (p. 61). Of course, he at once explains that he does not take the term "myth" in a rationalistic connotation; nevertheless his entire discussion on the point proves his dissensus from Lutheran orthodoxy. (Cf. pp. 60 ff.)

Not so cautious as Piper is Edwin Lewis in his book *A Philosophy of the Christian Revelation*. Lewis has a way of speaking in very obscure terms, which renders it difficult for the reader to understand just what he means. As a neo-orthodox Barthian, he speaks in words that suggest that he is not so very "far from the kingdom of God." But his book as a whole is a repudiation of the *sola Scriptura*. The Christian man, he maintains, is a Biblicist (one who adheres to the Bible); but he is not an uncritical Biblicist. He distinguishes between what is the *form* of revelation and what is its *substance*. (Cf. p. 141 f.) Doctrine is determined not at "the point of some documentary infallibility" (p. 61), but by one's faith and experience. And how shall the reader judge the following? "The Bible came into being because of a movement that was taking place in the lives of men over a long period of time. The movement was essentially religious" (p. 32); or: "Christ can never be fully understood from the study of Scripture alone" (p. 31); or: "The Church is a voice for God. Like the Scriptures themselves, it is a witness" (p. 74); or: "They [the Barthians] are not seeking merely to regalanize dead dogma. . . . They have recovered or retained for themselves what they believe is the essential character and the inner meaning of the Christian revelation" (p. 285); or: "The Resurrection is the dramatizing of the finality and indestructibility of self-giving love. It is a way of saying, in one overwhelming and inescapable divine word, that victory belongs to the cause with which Jesus Christ is forever identified" (p. 303); or: "Always must the Word become flesh" (p. 306). Lewis speaks in riddles, but riddles which definitely show that the *sola Scriptura* is not his specialty.

Princeton Theological Seminary is today the American headquarters of Barthianism, and its mouthpiece is *Theology Today*. In

its first issue, of April, 1944 (Vol. 1, No. 1) P. S. Minear has an article which bears the title "Wanted: a Biblical Theology." (Cf. pp. 47 ff.) But it is clear that the Biblical theology which Barthian Minear wants is not that of Luther and of St. Augustine and of St. Paul. What kind of Biblical theology *Theology Today* offers Dr. J. A. Mackay shows in the October, 1944, issue (Vol. 1, No. 3), in which he clearly states the neo-orthodox conception of revelation. Dr. Mackay is himself a churchman whose ministerial and missionary experience have brought him close to the Bible as a source of personal strength and comfort and as a means of successfully carrying on his work in a Roman Catholic environment. Hence Mackay's orthodox Reformed background exerts itself even now when at Princeton he has turned Barthian. (Cf. *The Sunday School Times*, Sept. 18, 1943, on Mackay's attack on the inerrancy of Scripture. The same article considers also the doctrinal positions of Homrighausen, E. Lewis, and R. Niebuhr.)

In his editorial Mackay says that at its lowest the Bible is a monument of human literature. Again, the Bible is a book of supreme religious genius. In the third place, it is the record of divine revelation, as which it is a book about Jesus Christ, who is the center of it. As such it becomes, he says, "the chief source book of our knowledge about God and His purpose for mankind," for which reason all true theology must be Biblical theology" (p. 288 ff.). Here already the liberal Barthianism of Dr. Mackay manifests itself, for he does not interpret the Bible in terms of orthodox Reformed tradition, but in a way in which only a Barthian can speak. He writes: "In this book is contained the self-disclosure of God in great redemptive deeds, and in prophetic, interpretative words." That is not the language of traditional orthodoxy. Lastly, however, Dr. Mackay regards the Bible as "the *supreme medium of divine-human intercourse*" (italics his). "Here God speaks directly to men today in all the complexity of their need, in all the phases and aberrations of their human situation." He goes on: "In this book God meets men face to face. God spoke to Luther through the Bible in his penitential ascent of the Scala Santa in Rome. He spoke to Karl Barth through Paul's Letter to the Romans. . . . God is encountered in the Bible; that is the stupendous fact. Following that encounter, something happens of life-transforming character." Now all this sounds very orthodox, but what Dr. Mackay and other Barthians thus write has taken on a different meaning. Just before this Mackay had criticized the "exclusive use of the Bible as the inspired and authoritative source book for Christian doctrine." This, he says, has led to Scholasticism, both Protestant and Roman (which, of course, is not true). It has created a "tendency to make Christianity corset in a relationship

to a book instead of a relationship to God, to substitute Biblical knowledge about God for personal acquaintanceship with the God who becomes known in the Bible" (which also is not true, since all sincere Christians who regard the Bible as the inspired, inerrant Word of God have used it for the purpose it was given, namely, to make sinners wise unto salvation through faith in Christ Jesus).

What, then, does Barthianism mean by saying that the Bible is "the supreme medium of divine-human intercourse"? Barthianism is a religious philosophy built up on fundamental Reformed principles. One of these principles is that God needs no wagon or escort to come into the heart of man but that efficacious grace acts immediately; or, as others have put it, divine truth attends the regeneration of men, but is not its means. Reformedism does not recognize the Gospel as a means of grace, as orthodox Lutheranism does. When, therefore, Barthians speak of the Bible as "the supreme medium of divine-human intercourse," they merely regard it as an accompanying circumstance of the Spirit's operation. God uses the Bible to speak to men, however, not necessarily what the words say, but whatever He means to reveal to men, just as God uses a storm or a war or a beautiful mountain scenery to convey to him the verity of His presence and operation. Barthianism is enthusiasm (just as Calvinism is enthusiasm), for it separates the operation of the Spirit from the Word; only Barthianism is much more extreme in its attitude toward the Bible. In fact, Barthianism is so opposed to the orthodox proposition that "the Bible is the Word of God" that it now largely speaks of the Bible as being the Word of God only inasmuch and in so far as Christ, the living Word, is there revealed to us. ("Christ is the Word.") For this reason Barthians welcome destructive higher criticism as something not at all harmful but even beneficial to Scripture; for according to Barthianism the Spirit is not attached to words, and there must not be any Scholastic letter-service. This accounts also for the definite indifference of Barthians over against doctrine in general, and, above all, for their refusal to enter into doctrinal distinctions. Barthianism is essentially rationalism and syncretistic Liberalism; and while the movement just now is relatively orthodox in some theological circles, it is bound to swing over to extreme Modernism as soon as that trend to Modernism again becomes more popular. *The Westminster Theological Journal* (Vols. 1, 2, 3; November, 1938, to May, 1941) contains several articles which the writer cordially recommends to his readers as an antidote against Barthian Liberalism. One, "The Inspiration of the Scripture" (Vol. 2, p. 73 ff.), is by John Murray, professor of systematic theology; another by N. B. Stonehouse, professor of New Testament, which bears the title "Jesus in the Hands of a Barthian" (Vol. 1, p. 1 ff.).

The latter's subtitle is "Rudolf Bultmann's Jesus in the Perspective of a Century of Criticism." It is indeed a very helpful, illuminating article, which is to be recommended to all who see in Barthianism the golden mean between "orthodox Scholasticism" and agnostic Modernism. Barthianism is powerless over against modern religious liberalism just because it has surrendered and is directly opposing the *sola Scriptura*.²⁴

Unfortunately, Barthianism has crept also into Lutheran circles. *The Lutheran Church Quarterly* (Vol. XVII, No. 3, July, 1944) contains an article by H. C. Alleman, "The Bible as the Word of God," in which there is denied not only the verbal inspiration but also the inerrancy and authority of Scripture as such. Then the writer asserts that the Bible is God's Word only because it sets forth Christ, who is the Word. A few quotations may show what Dr. Alleman has to say on the point. "Textual criticism has shown that we do not have an infallible text" (p. 216); or: "In its simplest analysis the voice of prophecy was the extension of the voice of conscience" (p. 218); or: "They [the followers of Luther] have made the Old Testament a kind of gazeteer of the historical Jesus" (p. 221); or: "The Bible had authority for him [Luther] because of the message it contained and not because of any artificial attestation with which it was supposed to be invested" (*ibid.*); or: "The authority of the Bible therefore resides not in an infallible text or in ecclesiastical decrees" (p. 223). The article is *in toto* an absolute disavowal of the infallible Scriptures.

IV

But we must bring our discussion to a close. There are two thoughts which we would like to impress upon our readers for conscientious consideration. The one is that the *sola Scriptura* is today the outstanding doctrine in controversy. All the forces of evil are engaged in breaking down the foundation upon which our Christian hope is built, and theologians must again seriously consider the question: "Is the Bible the inspired, infallible Word of God, the only source and norm of faith?" The other thought is that if Christendom surrenders the *sola Scriptura*, it is hopelessly sold out to religious Liberalism, Modernism, and atheism. The *sola gratia* can be preserved only if the *sola Scriptura* is kept intact. Well has John Murray written in his article "The Inspiration of the

24) Since it has become fashionable to praise Reinhold Niebuhr's *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, let the reader be reminded that neither of the two Niebuhrs preaches the Gospel of the crucified Christ; their books do not at all point out the way of salvation by God's grace through faith in Christ's vicarious atonement. Nor do the two Niebuhrs preach the Law of God as it is taught in Scripture. What both proclaim is a *sophia logou*, a philosophy of religion, which is neither pure Law nor pure Gospel.

Scripture": "How precious it is that in this world of sin with its vagaries of unbelief, its fluctuating philosophies, its dim light which is darkness, and wisdom which is foolishness with God, its bewilderment and despair, we have a sure Word of prophecy, whereunto we do well in taking heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place until the day dawn and the daystar arise in our hearts!"²⁵ Those who destroy a nation's faith in the Holy Bible are indeed its greatest enemies, and what everlasting harm they do to souls purchased with Christ's blood only eternity will show.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Books

- Aubrey, E. E., *Present Theological Tendencies*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1936.
- Baillie, John, and Martin, Hugh (editors), *Revelation*. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1937.
- Bandas, R. G., *Contemporary Philosophy and Thomistic Principles* (translated by J. S. Zyburg). Bruce Publishing Co., New York, 1932.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Divine-Human Encounter* (translated by A. W. Loos). The Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1943.
- Brunner, Emil, *The Word and the World*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1931.
- Engelder, Theodore, *Reason or Revelation?* Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1941.
- Engelder, Theodore, *Scripture Cannot be Broken*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1944.
- Garnett, A. C., *A Realistic Philosophy of Religion*. Willett, Clark and Co., New York, 1942.
- Horsch, John, *Modern Religious Liberalism*. Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, 1938.
- Horton, W. M., *Theology in Transition*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1943.
- Jones, R. M., *The Eternal Gospel*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1938.
- Kirk, K. D., *The Study of Theology*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1939.
- Knudson, A. C., *Present Tendencies in Religious Thought*. The Abingdon Press, New York, 1925.
- Lewis, E., *A Philosophy of Christian Revelation*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1940.
- Luthardt, C. E., *Kompendium der Dogmatik* (13. Auflage). Doerffling und Franke, Leipzig, 1933.
- Mackintosh, H. R., *Types of Modern Theology*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1939.
- Mains, G. P., *Divine Inspiration*. George H. Doran Company, New York, 1915.
- Meyer, Hans, *The Philosophy of Thomas Aquinas* (translated by F. Eckhoff). B. Herder Book Company, St. Louis, 1944.
- Morrison, C. C., *What Is Christianity?* Willett, Clark and Co., Chicago, 1941.
- Mueller, John Theodore, *Christian Dogmatics*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1934.
- Niebuhr, H. R., *The Meaning of Revelation*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1941.

25) *Westminster Theological Journal*, Vol. II, p. 104.

- Niebuhr, Reinhold, *The Nature and Destiny of Man* (2 volumes). Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1943.
- Piper, Otto, *God in History*. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1939.
- Piper, Otto, *Die Grundlagen der evangelischen Ethik*, I. Band. C. Bertelsmann in Guetersloh, 1928.
- Rall, H. F., *Christianity*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1940.
- Reu, M., *Luther and the Scriptures*. The Wartburg Press, Columbus, Ohio, 1943.
- Robinson, H. W., *Redemption and Revelation*. Harper and Brothers, New York, 1941.
- Scholl, Werner, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, IV/I. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1933.
- Soederblom, Nathan, *The Nature of Revelation* (translated by F. E. Pamp). Oxford University Press, New York, 1933.
- Walther, Wilhelm, *Lehrbuch der Symbolik*. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig, 1924.
- Warfield, B. B., *Revelation and Inspiration*. Oxford University Press, New York, 1927.
- * * *

- Concordia Triglotta*. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, 1921.
- Liberal Theology: an Appraisal*, Essays in Honor of E. W. Lyman. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1942.
- Protestantism, a Symposium*, Commission on Courses of Study. The Methodist Church, Nashville, Tenn., 1944.

2. Periodicals

- Alleman, Herbert C., "The Bible as the Word of God," *The Lutheran Church Quarterly*, Vol. XVII, No. 3, July, 1944, pp. 215—225.
- Barth, Karl, "Das Wort in der Theologie von Schleiermacher bis Ritschl," *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 6. Jahrgang, S. 92—109.
- Kraeling, Emil G., "The Church and the Bible," *The Union Review*, Vol. IV, No. 1, December, 1942, p. 18 ff.
- Mackay, John A., "Concerning Protestant Christianity," *Theology Today*, Vol. I, No. 3, October, 1944, pp. 285—293.
- Murray, John, "The Inspiration of the Scripture," *The Westminster Theological Journal*, Vol. II, pp. 73—104.
- Rynd, Reginald, "Religious Autonomy and Revelation," *The Hibbert Journal*, Vol. XLI, No. 4, April, 1943, pp. 299—303.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Catholic Tributes to Luther

I. As Preacher

In the centuries immediately preceding the Reformation the preaching monks regaled their hearers with tales of Troy and silly stories of the saints in order to catch the penny collection, and "penny preachers" they were called by Brother Berthold of Regensburg in the thirteenth century.

Even Cardinal and Archbishop Stephen Langton of Canterbury preached on an old French dancing song, applying "the Fair Alice" to the Virgin. "Stale and absurd" such things were called by the Dominican Jacob Eckard.

Geiler von Kaisersberg at Strassburg preached a whole course of sermons on Sebastian Brant's *Ship of Fools*. Benito Mussolini (in his *John Hus*) quotes Hus: "Alas! In my youth I once participated in a masquerade. An infamous student was designated as bishop; then he was placed astride an ass with his face turned towards its tail; and thus he was conducted to Mass. In front of him were carried a bowl of soup and a tankard of beer, and even in the church were these things kept before him. I saw him offer incense at the altar, raise one foot in the air and call in a loud voice: 'It is drunk!' And the students carried before him some huge torches in the manner of tapers; he went on offering incense from altar to altar; then the students turned their caps inside out and began to dance in the church, and the people looked on and laughed and imagined that holy and legitimate rites were being performed."

Erasmus was in the papal chapel to hear a sermon delivered before Pope Julius II and a congregation of great churchmen on Good Friday.

The preacher began with praising the Pope as Jupiter Tonans, hurling from his potent hand the thunderbolt of war and shaking the earth by his nod. Then Decius, Curtius, Regulus, even Iphigenia, were brought in to illustrate the sacrifice of the Cross, and parallels were drawn between Socrates, Epaminondas, Phocion, Scipio, and the Author of Christianity, who, however, was not expressly named, the word "Jesus" not being in the Ciceronian vocabulary, to which the reverend orator strictly confined himself.

On the Feast of St. John Baptist in 1517 in the presence of Leo X the preacher appealed to the gods and goddesses "in a manner more pagan than Christian," writes Paris de Grassis, Master of Ceremonies.

Mario Equicola at the beatification of Leo X quoted Castor, Romulus, and others, who had been raised to be gods.

At the Lateran Council the bishops were told the name of Christ would have been forgotten but for the monks; outside the convents few Italians knew any theology.

Marsilio Ficino was charged with practicing magical arts; he mixed up Platonism with Christianity to a dangerous extent. He addressed his hearers as "beloved in Plato." Lamps were burned before his picture, he was ranked with the Apostles and the Prophets; feasts were celebrated in his honor, his writings were to be read in the churches on Sundays.

At the funeral of Cardinal Bibbiena and in the presence of the Pope, Pierio Valeriano appealed to the cardinal's shade, "We ask not to what part of Olympus thine immortal virtue has led thee in thy golden chariot; but when thou passest through the

heavenly spheres, and when thou beholdest the heroes there, then forget not to pray to the King of heaven and the other gods that, if they wish to enjoy the worship of others on earth, they may add to Leo's life the years of which the impious Fates have deprived thee and Giuliano de' Medici."

In a letter to the Elector-Cardinal-Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz Erasmus put in a good word for Luther and said, "It has distressed pious minds to hear in the universities scarcely a single discourse about the doctrine of the Gospel, to see those sacred authors so long approved by the Church now considered antiquated, to hear in sermons very little about Christ, but a great deal about the power of the Pope, and the opinion of recent writers thereon. Every discourse openly manifests self-interest, flattery, ambition, and pretense."

A reformation was needed; it came.

Staupitz deserted Dr. Luther, but shortly before his death on December 28, 1524, wrote to Luther: "My love for you is most constant, passing the love of women, always unbroken. . . . We owe much to you, Martin, for having led us back from the husks that swine did eat to the pastures of life and the words of salvation."

Lilly says, "Luther departed wholly from the established type of sermon, founding himself not upon the Scholastics, but upon the Bible, and especially upon the Epistles attributed to St. Paul." "Luther wielded with supreme dominion the High Dutch (*sic!*) dialect spoken by his countrymen, and made of it the German language. 'A most powerful master of the German language' he has been called; and with good reason. . . . His words are instinct with life. They burn with purpose and power. 'He flashes out illumination from him.' Carlyle well says, 'His smiting idiomatic phrases seem to cleave into the very secret of the matter.' And this marvelous power of expression doubtless came from the intensity and directness of his insight. 'Those demoniac eyes of his,' which so impressed Cardinal Aleander [Cajetan?], were true symbols of his mental vision. . . . He saw it as no one else. And he made his hearers, his readers, see it as he saw it, and believe in his belief. There are few things more notable about him than his extraordinary personal ascendancy over his followers. . . . It was an ascendancy, as Nisard notes, which kept well-nigh all of them under his yoke until his death."

Audin testifies, "For the first time, a Christian preacher was seen to abandon the Schoolmen and draw his texts and illustrations from the writings of inspiration." "Luther knew the secret of the gifts which God had bestowed upon him. His language consorted with his external appearance. Sometimes it floated in a lyrical excess, or savored of intoxication, to use an expression of Erasmus;

sometimes it was coquettish like a female, employing allegory as a veil, to excite curiosity; by turns simple as a parable, impassioned as an ode; daring as an eagle in its flight, or like a white-plumed dove, as Menzel says; and sometimes so indifferent to human art, so disdainful of every check, so extravagant in its conduct, that his language seemed not that of a priest, but rather of another Hans Sachs. Even the Catholics were seduced, and attributed to the influence of evil spirits, as did Prateolus, that deceptive charm which, according to his disciples, breathed of the Holy Ghost: a wonderful organization, destined to command wherever there was trouble. Place him in the time of the Gracchi, and he would have carried with him the senate and the people; in that of the Crusades, and he would have repeated, had he believed, the miracles of St. Bernard; in a public assembly like the National, and he would have been something greater than Mirabeau if he had faith; in the seventeenth century, in our Catholic pulpits, and he would have been a second Bossuet and Bridaine." "If he ascended the pulpit, the people expected with anxiety the words which were to drop from his mouth. His eye, which seemed to roll in an orbit of fire, his large brow, his flushed face, as after high excitement, his threatening gesture, his voice which roared like thunder, the burning breath with which his bosom was charged, cast his hearers into terror or ecstasies. It was known when Luther was in the pulpit by the suspended breathing of the audience, 'who hesitated as if the Lord,' says Calvin, 'were thundering by the lips of the preacher.' Beza said, 'Luther is an excellent organ of God, divinely inspired; he that does not sense the Spirit of God in him does not sense anything.' He returns to the strife impassioned with that language in which he is so powerful and unrivaled; to that fiery eloquence which inflames, excites, and electrifies like a war song, and which alarms even his disciples."

Florimond de Rémond says, "Nature had been very favorable to him, both in body and mind. For . . . he had an active and lively genius, a happy memory, much ease of expression, eloquent and fluent beyond any of his time. When he was in the pulpit, full of fire and energy, he threw a life into everything he said and, like a torrent, carried with him the minds of his hearers; a grace which is unnatural to the people of the North."

Erasmus wrote Luther in 1526, "I know the violence of your speech and the forest-torrent that plunges from the mountain with terrible roar and tears with it blocks of rocks and trunks of trees."

Janssen observes, "Luther's expression is rich and pithy; his exposition full of movement and life; his similes, with all their simplicity, seize and fire the imagination; he drew from the richest sources of the tongue of the people; in popular eloquence few have come near him."

II. As Teacher

The crowned poet Petrarch, priest, canon, archdeacon, friend of Popes and princes, called by some "the first modern man," poured the vials of scorn on the Scholastic system and branded the universities as nests of ignorance, adorning fools with pompous degrees of Master and Doctor.

He wrote Giovanni Colonna, "The real wisdom of God is Christ. In order to attain true philosophy, we must love and reverence Him above all things. We must first be Christians—then we may be what we will. Through the Gospel of Christ alone can we become wise and happy. On the Gospel alone as upon the one immovable foundation can human diligence build all true learning."

Lilly says Aeneas Sylvius, Pope Pius II, told the University of Vienna, "Our whole study is in empty quibbles."

"Erasmus, more than anyone else, represented the revolt of the intellect against this philosophy."

Nisard has pungently characterized the philosophy dominant at the opening of the sixteenth century as "an amalgam of the corrupted tradition of Aristotle with the not less corrupted tradition of Christianity."

Savonarola thundered, "Why, instead of expounding so many books—Aristotle and Plato, Vergil and Petrarch—do they not expound the one Book in which is the law and spirit of life?"

Adriano Corneto in 1507 at Bologna published his *True Philosophy*, in which he says Holy Scripture is the only source of all faith and all knowledge, and condemns Aristotle, whom Christians must avoid. Cardinal Castellesi said the same.

Baudrillart says, "Erasmus committed Humanism to absolute contempt for the Scholastic philosophy." "The Italian Humanists mocked at Scholasticism." "The ribald and blasphemous witticisms of Rabelais amused a greater number of people than they scandalized"—in the fourth book of *Pantagruel*. In the *Gargantua* he "ridicules the doctors of the Sorbonne. He was an adversary of the clergy; he revived the mockery and gross invective of the poets of the 14. and 15. centuries against priests and monks; a rival of Luther in his pamphlets against the Pope." Michelet calls him a "great prophet, of profound faith." Bishop Jean du Bellay of Paris called Rabelais' book "a new gospel, and pre-eminently the book."

Dean John Colet of St. Paul's denounced Aquinas: "If he had not been possessed with arrogance, he would not have defined everything with so much temerity and pride; and if he had not had something of the worldly spirit, he would not have corrupted the whole doctrine of Christ with his profane philosophy."

Bishop Gore comments, "No one can interpret the Reformation rightly, on its religious side, who does not bear in mind the existence of a widespread and passionate desire to get back to the Christ of the Gospels and the primitive Church."

Erasmus ridicules the vain efforts of the Schoolmen, those pseudo-theologians. They define the indefinable, they distinguish the indistinguishable, and they divide the indivisible. They are like the heads of the Hydra: the more you cut them, the more they grow. He agreed with St. Ambrose that it did not please God to save men by dialectic, as he wrote to Martin Dorp.

In the *Praise of Folly* he says the Schoolmen "possess such learning and subtlety that I fancy that even the Apostles themselves would need another Spirit if they had to engage with this new race of divines."

Martin Pollich, "the Light of the World," "the First Rector and Parent" of the University of Wittenberg, opposed the studies of the day. Audin says, "At Leipzig, where for some time he was professor, the School divinity had been the subject of his ridicule; all its divines, in succession, had fallen under the weight of the Doctor's sarcasms; even Thomas, the angel of the Schoolmen, had not been spared."

Francis Bacon rejected the authority of the Schoolmen.

Egmund of the University of Louvain feared the New Testament "written" by Erasmus would bring the whole Scholastic and monastic system to an end. Fool that he was, he was not altogether a fool.

Pastor admits Scholasticism had become degenerated and furthermore says, Carmelites of Bologna held there was no harm in asking for things from demons. Astrology was at home in the universities of Padua, Milan, and Bologna.

In Bergamo a canon of the cathedral preached Christ suffered not from love of the human race, but was forced by astral influences; and theft and robbery are not mortal sins.

The Vice-Chancellor of Oxford, the Warden of New College, and the Dean of Cardinal College in February, 1528, consulted an astrologer in order to find Garret, who had spread Lutheran books.

Sixtus IV and Paul III believed in astrology. Julius II put off his enthronement till the stars pointed out a lucky day. Had not Marsilio Ficino foretold Giovanni de' Medici would sit in the seat of St. Peter? And now the credulity of Leo X increased.

The great wit Saint Sir Thomas More was quite sure miracles happened at shrines. The prince of letters, Erasmus, hung votive offerings in churches. He used a charm, a cup marked with an "astrological lion" which gave virtue to his drink. He consulted

the notorious quack Philippus Theophrastus Aureolus Bombastes Paracelsus.

Well, if Vergil, Cicero, and Seneca believed in astrology, why not their disciples?

Mark Twain joked, "Everybody talks about the weather, but nobody does anything about it." All the world of Humanists talked about Scholasticism; nobody did anything about it—with one exception. Luther was the only one to do anything about it.

In a disputation on September 4, 1517, he dethroned Aristotle and enthroned Christ. He gave grave offense at the universities of Erfurt, Leipzig—and Wittenberg. Early in 1518 he wrote his old master Trutvetter at Erfurt, "I absolutely believe that it is impossible to reform the Church unless the canons, the decretals, the Scholastic theology, philosophy, and logic, as they are now treated, are utterly rooted up and new studies put in their place. I may seem to you no logician, nor perhaps am I; but one thing I know, that in defense of this opinion I fear no man's logic." He wrote, "Aristotle gradually descends to eternal ruin. The lectures on the 'Sentences' are wonderfully disdained. Only teachers of the new Biblical theology can hope for hearers."

Christopher Scheurl, Professor of Law, wrote a great change in theological studies was in sight, and soon it would be possible to become a theologian without either Aristotle or Plato.

Roger Bacon in the thirteenth century said, "If I had all the books of Aristotle in my power, I should cause every one of them to be burned, because studying them is a loss of time and a cause of error and a multiplication of ignorance, beyond what can be explained."

Pope Martin V preached, "While we possess Augustine, what care we for the sagacity of Aristotle, the eloquence of Plato, the prudence of Varro, the dignified gravity of Socrates, the authority of Pythagoras, or the skill of Empedocles?"

Clayton admits, theological studies in monasteries and priories were at the ebb. Scholasticism had petered out in trivialities and futile questions. The laity thus shepherded were but scantily taught the rudiments of Christian faith and morals . . . multitudes grew up in ignorance.

Learning was regarded with aversion by the priesthood, unlearned and not trained to desire learning. . . . Erasmus and other German Humanists were ill prepared for the theological controversy raised by Luther.

Joseph Clayton writes, Luther's two catechisms are "admirably effective for the instruction of ministers and laity. . . . Luther's intimate knowledge of the people for whom he wrote, is manifest in these catechisms. No invective nor violent abuse of the Pope, the Mass, or the old religion of Germany distract the

reader or arouse ill will to the author. Luther, writing for people still nominally Catholic but largely ignorant of Catholic faith and doctrine, avoids creating prejudice against his evangel. He intrudes no comments liable to hostile interpretation. The old Catholic rule, long obscured through the neglect of bishops and parish priests, is followed in the *Little Catechism*. . . . His purpose was to establish a lively and reasonable Christian faith among people growing up in doubt and extreme perplexity—the old order being apparently overthrown, a new order not plainly set up—and to check the flood of paganism that threatened to submerge all Christian belief and the very existence of all moral law.

"When Luther wrote, he rarely wrote in vain. The catechisms did achieve very largely the purpose of their author. Thousands lost to the Catholic Church were saved from utter unbelief by these documents. . . .

"Luther's was not the first, but it was so vastly superior to anything of the sort in existence that it swiftly won its tremendous popularity. Several attempts had been made to answer the Lutheran catechism, but they were, unhappily, dull. Dullness is fatal to a catechism. Indeed it takes a man of genius for popular writing and combined with scholarship."

Aleander on April 5, 1521, wrote Cardinal Medici the Pope should "by praise and reward encourage men of talent to make an intelligent study of Scripture and put their pens to work, after the example of the Germans, in defense of the faith."

Lilly writes, "In his lectures Professor Luther went back from Aquinas to Augustine, from the *Sentences* to the Scriptures, with no thought of disloyalty to the Church. An appeal from the degenerate disciples of Aquinas and Scotus to Christ and His Apostles."

Audin says, "The monks then ruled the schools, under the shadow of Aristotle: a revolution was required to overthrow their dynasty. . . .

"They found themselves opposed to an adversary who had himself been educated in the schools, a monk also, who required no inspiration of wit from the ancients, but whose ridicule was impassioned and fiery . . . and who was the first to introduce into theological controversy warmth, eloquence, intemperate and coarse language. . . . Luther's ax was too weighty for them to wield."

"A few words dropped from an obscure chair, by a professor who had not even wherewith to cover himself in winter, excited the Catholic world . . . in Latin, of which he was absolute master.

"Never before had been heard from any chair in Saxony an exposition so luminous as that of the professor, upon the Old and New Testaments. He spent days and nights on it, scarcely eating or sleeping."

III. As Translator

Duke George of Saxony hated Luther with a perfect hatred, but liked his German New Testament immensely. He heartily wished the scoundrel would put the whole Bible into German and then go to the devil.

Luther cheerfully fulfilled the first part of the pious wish.

Jerome Emser, secretary to Duke George, severely denounced Luther's New Testament. Then he "took" it, put in some errors, his notes, and copies of Luther's pictures, bought from Cranach for forty dollars, and published it under his own name! Imitation is sincere flattery, but misappropriation is the sincerest flattery.

John Dietenberger took practically Luther's whole German Bible and published it under his own name! What a sincere tribute to Luther!

John Cochlaeus, "the Scourge of Luther," scourged Luther for his German New Testament. "Tailors and shoemakers, yes, even women and other simple idiots read it most eagerly as the fountain of all truth. Some carried it about and learned it by heart. Within a few months they trusted they had so much competence and experience that they were not afraid to dispute not only with Catholic laymen, but also with priests and monks, yes, even with Masters and Doctors of Theology about faith and the Gospel. The Lutheran crowd was much more diligent to learn the Bible than the Catholics themselves, since the laymen left that care to the priests and monks. Thus the Lutheran laymen could often readily quote Scripture more than the Catholic monks and priests. And they were taught by Luther to believe and accept nothing but what was taken from Scripture. Therefore the Catholics had to bear it to be accused of, and blamed for, their ignorance and stupidity, though otherwise the most learned theologians. . . . The Lord graciously kept some from bending the knee to the Saxon Baal. . . .

"The Lutheran books were usually printed most beautifully and carefully, but the Catholic books carelessly and corrupt. A countless crowd sold Lutheran books all over Germany. Bibles were burned."

Bishop John Faber of Vienna, court preacher of King Ferdinand, was against indulgences and Eck, and friendly towards Luther, but later he wailed bitterly Luther's Bible had done more damage than all the hail in Egypt.

Kaspar Ulenberg at Koeln in 1617 got out a revision of his own, but says of Luther's Bible, "What Luther held to be the meaning of the text he clothed in pure and beautiful German, on the extremely fine development of which he had all his life spent much labor. In the German language he surpassed all, and no one could be compared with him. In this translation of the Bible

he really took pains above all through a certain beauty and grace of speech to attract all to read and to win the minds of men."

Audin "cannot forget that of which Germany is so justly proud—the German Bible, the noblest monument which he has raised to his native country. . . . We are pleased with the cultivator of art and poetry; in the prefaces—which are models of style—the genius of the translator is tinged with the colors of the original. There are pages which flow spontaneously from his pen, so full of inspiration that you might fancy you heard the Prophet himself. For example, in his estimate of the Psalms, a book of which he was passionately fond. . . . He is engaged upon a colossal work, which would daunt any other but himself—the translation of the Bible into the German language, a task of which the accomplishment has invested his reputation as a scholar with so bright a halo. . . . We cling to that wondrous being. There is in the letters which he writes from his 'Patmos' a mass of internal paintings which captivate by the finish of the details, almost like a picture by Karel du Jardin. . . . His incontestable glory. . . . Both Catholics and Protestants regarded it as an honor done to their ancient idiom."

Friedrich von Schlegel says, "It is well known to you that all true philologists regard this as the standard and model of classical expression in the German language; and that not only Klopstock but many other writers of the first rank have fashioned their style and selected their phrases according to the rules of this version. . . . We owe to him the highest gratitude for placing in our hands this most noble and manly model of German expression. Even in his own writings he displays a most original eloquence, surpassed by but few names that occur in the whole history of literature. He had, indeed, all those qualities which fit a man to be a revolutionary orator. . . .

"As to the intellectual power and greatness of Luther . . . I think there are few, even of his own disciples, who esteem him highly enough. . . . It was upon him and his soul that the fate of Europe depended."—*Lect. Hist. Lit.*

"None of the other heads and leaders of the new religious party had the power, or were in a situation, to uphold the Protestant religion: its present existence is solely and entirely the work and the deed of one man, unique in his way, and who holds unquestionably a conspicuous place in the history of the world."—*Philosophy of History.*

Prof. Seb. Merkle of Wuerzburg admits, "Luther proved himself a gigantic and original theologian in finding justification by faith alone, apart from the works of the Law. Denifle was the

first to deny this. Dr. F. X. Kiefl, Professor of Dogmatics at Wuerzburg, with all vigor defended Luther against the assault of Denifle."

Ernesto Buoniauti is more bitter than Janssen, Denifle, and Grisar, but he defends Luther against Denifle's charge of "Ignoramus or Liar" in the matter of Rom. 1:16, 17. He pays his tribute to Luther's genial translation of the Bible.

Cardinal Newman says with reluctant admiration, "The translated Bible is the stronghold of heresy."

Froude adds, "It was the seat and center of real infallibility to those whose consciences rejected the false infallibility of the Pope."

IV. As Hymnist

Audin gives "unreserved praise to the hymns which he translated from Latin into German, and which he composed. He is grave, solemn, simple, grand. . . . He was at once the poet and musician of a great number of his hymns."

Joseph von Eichendorff, died 1857: "The first Protestant Church hymns are fine war hymns, made in the turmoil of mental battle or in times of stress in the nightly rounds of sentry service, full of manly trust in good luck and bad luck, and all hardly thinkable without song. Here, too, Luther's heroic, utterly popular personality and moving language mastery with his 'A Mighty Fortress' opened the way."

Baudrillart asks and answers his question, "To what must be attributed this growth of virtue which we respectfully and joyfully acknowledge in our separated brethren when we come across it?"

"It must be attributed to the Christian life left by the Reformation; to that religious sentiment which is certainly not more Protestant than Catholic, but which is absolutely Christian, although too many Catholics think they can do without it; to the reading of the Bible, when they have remained faithful to it, for the Bible has placed them in presence of revealed truth—of the Gospel; to those hymns so beautiful and penetrating which have kept up religious emotion and often a real piety in their souls in spite of the natural aridity of the cult."

Erich Sinz tells us, "A priest searched a Lutheran hymnal for dogmatic errors, but with the best of will found none. He was surprised at the beauty of many a hymn and the stream of grace breaking through all over."

Joseph Clayton says after the Council of Trent "the very music of the Church was changed when Palestrina became director of music at Rome; the old ribald and florid stuff was prohibited—to the distress of its admirers and the indignation of singers and choirs who revelled in its performance."

An influential reformer, that man Luther.

Oak Park, Ill.

WILLIAM DALLMANN

Outlines on Gospels Adopted by Synodical Conference

Festival of Epiphany

Luke 4:16-21

With January sixth the "Twelve Nights" have ended. In the struggle between light and darkness light has prevailed. The light of Redemption also gained the victory over the darkness of Satan's rule. Epiphany signifies revelation, appearance. Luther holds that the best Epiphany text is the account of Jesus' baptism, which constitutes His inauguration to His prophetic office. Celestial light radiates from our text also. It reveals the light of day dawning upon the world.

Epiphany the Day of Light

1. Foretold by Isaiah
2. Fulfilled in Christ

1

A. Vv. 18, 19 are quoted from Is. 61. Isaiah often portrays the plight of heathen nations of his day under the picture of darkness, as 60:2. Also in Galilee the people are walking in darkness, 9:2. The night of idolatry, superstition, and immorality prevailed. There was no knowledge of salvation.

B. But the Prophet foretells the day of light piercing the darkness, 61:1, 2. He foresees One who is anointed with the Holy Spirit, whose mission is to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, a time of gracious visitation. Isaiah describes the day of light in detail. The spiritual maladies under which humanity groans are set forth under the names of poverty, brokenheartedness, captivity, blindness, and bruisedness. However, the "Servant of the Lord" (Is. 53) will usher in a day of healing and light, dispelling the heathen darkness and comforting languishing Israel by establishing His kingdom among them.

2

A. Vv. 16, 17. A stirring scene. An early utterance of Jesus, the Prophet, after He had been anointed with the Holy Ghost and with power at His baptism. The scroll is handed Him; He unrolls it, selects Is. 61 and reads. He sits down and returns the scroll to the synagog officer. Intently the eyes of all are fixed on Him, expecting a sermon. Only one sentence of His sermon is recorded: v. 21.

B. It was fulfilled. That day in Nazareth was the dawn of New Testament light, the opening of the acceptable year — allusion to year of jubilee, Lev. 25:10, a year of universal release for person and property; day of salvation, 2 Cor. 6:2; the time of thy visitation, Luke 19:44. Henceforth He preached the Gospel to the poor in spirit at the seashore, on mountain summits, in Jerusalem's

Temple, and in synagogues. He healed the brokenhearted, saying to paralytic: "Thy sins be forgiven thee." He brought liberty to captives, casting out evil spirits and opening prison house of sin to woman at Jacob's well. He opened eyes of spiritually blind, as Nicodemus, revealing to sinners His glory as of the Only-begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth. The bruised in conscience, as Mary Magdalene and the woman taken in adultery, He freed from the fetters of vice. Well did He say of His day: Luke 10:23.

C. Darkness covers the earth today as a shroud. The picture St. Paul unrolls, Rom. 1, of the cultured Greek and Roman world of his day applies to the civilized nations of our time. In the midst of war's horrors the men of the present generation make their faces harder than flint. Despising the Law and the Prophets, calloused man gropes in darkness and loves darkness. Modernism in churches; evolution theory has well-nigh obliterated remnant of knowledge of sin. Yet this is the glorious Gospel day. The glory of the Lord is risen upon our time. Epiphany light shining as darkness covers the earth. Nineteenth century was the mission century. Planning activity in Lutheran Church to rebuild after war in Europe and Asia. Once more the light of the Gospel is flaring up over the globe before eternal darkness shall settle upon earth. "O earth, earth, earth, hear the word of the Lord!" Jer. 22:29. Let the Church arise and shine!

L. J. ROEHM

First Sunday after Epiphany

John 6:27-40

Justification through faith in the atoning sacrifice of Christ is the chief article of the Christian religion, the article with which the Christian Church stands and falls. Cp. Formula of Concord, Sol. Decl., III, 6, *Trigl.* p. 917.

Why Is Faith in Christ So All-Important?

1. *Because no more than faith is required for man's salvation*
2. *Because the fullness of salvation is given to every believer*

1

On the day after feeding the five thousand Jesus told the Jews who still wanted to make Him their "bread king" (John 6:14, 15, 26) that they should not work for perishable food, v. 27. There are still thousands upon thousands who would accept Jesus if He would give them food, the full dinner pail, assure to them social security, freedom from want and fear. All this Jesus calls perishable food, which though helpful, needful, of course, for this present temporal life, and though a precious gift, will end and therefore

is not the greatest of gifts. There is another food, which is needful for a life of far greater importance than this fleeting life on earth: that food which the Son of Man, who is at the same time He whom God, even the Father, has sealed as His own Messiah, is ready to give to man, for which above all man must labor, work, v. 27.

At once the question arises which was asked by the Jews: v. 28. Note the plural "works." That is the question asked by natural, self-righteous man, who imagines that he is able to do those works demanded by God as the condition of eternal life; cp. Matt. 19:16, 20; Luke 10:25, 29. In direct contrast to this self-righteous spirit Christ answers: v. 29. The only work God demands is faith in Him who is sent of God to be the Redeemer of mankind. That is a work impossible to natural man, who cannot by his own reason or strength believe in Jesus Christ, his Lord, or come to Him; a work possible only through the life-giving grace of God, who gives man to Christ, vv. 37, 39, 65, draws him to Christ in everlasting love, v. 44; cp. Jer. 31:3. Faith is not a meritorious work, but merely accepting, taking, the Bread of Life, of far greater value than Moses' manna—the Bread which the Father gives from heaven, vv. 30-33, which the Son gives to man, v. 27, and which is none other than the Son, vv. 35, 48-51, who is both Gift and Giver. To obtain this Bread, to accept it as a free gift from heaven, to believe in Jesus as the Bread of Life, the Giver of eternal life, that is the one work demanded of man, the one thing needful. Acts 4:12.

2

Having Christ, we have all we need for eternal life, for He is the all-sufficient and universal Savior.

All-sufficient. V. 35. Having made this Bread of Life our own through faith, we shall never hunger nor thirst. There is no sin He has not atoned for, no penalty He has not paid, no guilt for which He has not suffered. He has redeemed us from the Law and has procured for us the adoption of sons, Gal. 4:1-7; Rom. 8:14-39. There is no fiery temptation that He cannot quench, no tribulation in which He cannot provide strength. He will lose none of those given to Him; not even death shall sever them from His presence or deprive them of eternal life, vv. 39, 40. All this through faith in Jesus!

Universal. Him that cometh to Me, I will in no wise cast out, v. 37. All are saved, and all are welcome! Only believe! Every one which seeth the Son and believeth on Him shall have everlasting life. That is the will of Him that sent the Son into the world to redeem mankind. Come, take this Bread. It is free for all. Is. 55:1 ff.

Faith indeed is the one thing needful. The *Lutheran Hymnal*, No. 366. Mark 9:24; Luke 17:5.

THEO. LAETSCH

Second Sunday after Epiphany

Matt. 12:46-50

In the season of the Epiphany we ponder how Jesus proved to the world that He is the Son of God and the Savior. This He did through His own miracles (today's Gospel story, the first). But He did it, and still does it, also through the creating of a new life in His followers, who say, "We, being many, are one body in Christ, and everyone members one of another" (Rom. 12:5, introducing today's Epistle), and who are epiphanies of the Savior's power, Gal. 6:17; Phil. 3:17 ff. The Savior teaches this truth in His startling manner in our text:

Christians Are Christ's Kinsmen that They Might Do the Father's Will

I. Our sluggishness to recognize this fact.

A. In the days of Jesus. The Jews thought that to do God's will, it was necessary to be a Jew, a keeper of the Law. Even Jesus' friends and close acquaintances, those who sought to follow Him, were inclined to think that human relation and intimacy implied a higher position in His Kingdom, a closer approximation to the ideal; cf. text and Matt. 20:20 ff. (Immaterial whether "brethren" implies sons by Mary and Joseph or cousins; a blood kinship is the implication of the text.)

B. Today. — 1. Also now men may assume that association with the Church, a part in its material activity, is the thing. This is an especial danger in an age materialistic like ours and the Savior's own time. — 2. This is a tragedy, because it wrecks the activity of God and Christ, makes the Kingdom of God of no effect. Cf. pessimistic utterances of the present, by churchmen and others, on the coldness and uselessness of the Church; or the indictment of Sardis, Rev. 3:1. No epiphany there.

II. The real meaning of this fact.

A. What it means to do the Father's will. — 1. God made man in His image, to want what He wants, to love as He loves, to be holy as He is holy. — 2. He planned this exercise of His will to take place in all the relations of life, right where we are and as we live, on earth as in heaven.

B. What it takes to do the Father's will. — 1. The Fall broke the image, wrecked the activity of God in man, replaced holiness and love with sin and hate. When man looks at sinful man, he does not see God — 2. God sent His Son into the world to restore the life of God in man; John 1; John 3; Eph. 2:1-10. That Christ did through the work of the atonement on the cross. That work is made man's own through the work of the Holy Spirit. So men

become God's children again, John 1:12; and God uses the tools of Gospel and Sacrament to that end. Cf. parallel of text, Luke 8:21; or James 1:18; 1 Pet. 1:22, 23; Eph. 2:10.

C. He who does the Father's will is Christ's kinsman. — 1. Jesus did not despise human relationships; they serve the launching of man into the world, and are a testing ground of Christian love; cf. Luke 2:51; John 2:5; 19:26, 27. — 2. But the relation which means heavenly life and the life of God, the life of love and obedience to the commands of God, is the relation to God which we have through Christ our Savior, by faith in Him and the new life wrought by His Spirit. We are still in the world for the purpose of living that life and proving that kinship to Christ. Cf. especially John 15:14-16.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Third Sunday after Epiphany

Luke 4:38-44

For the economic welfare of the nation two problems must be solved, the problems of supply and distribution. There must be an abundance of things for the country's needs, and this abundance must be distributed so that everyone will receive what he requires. In the story related in our text the Savior solved these problems.

How God Provides for the Needs of Men

1. *God provides in abundant measure*
2. *God provides for the needs of all*

1

Jesus visited Peter's home. The disciple's mother-in-law was ill with a "great fever." The Savior healed her. That was a great miracle. But note what followed. She ministered unto them. Usually after illness there is gradual convalescence while the patient rests quietly. This woman is very ill in one moment and able to do housework the next. Here is help in great abundance, more than anyone could expect. That is the way God does when His children cry for help. He gives an abundant supply. Think of the feeding of the five thousand, with basketfuls left over, the miraculous draught of fishes, the wedding at Cana. God has promised to shower His gifts upon us abundantly. Deut. 30:9; Amos 9:13. And that is the way it is with God's spiritual gifts. He gives them to us in overflowing abundance. John 10:10; 2 Cor. 9:8. There are Bibles and Christian literature enough for all. There is much preaching of the pure Word in churches and over the radio. There is no dearth of things that the soul needs. Furthermore, when a sinner is converted and becomes a believer, God does not do a little of it and lets the sinner do the rest. He does it all.

In Peter's house the woman was very sick in one hour and able to work the next. That is the way God does in conversion. There is no half-way measure. The sinner becomes a saint. Conversion is not a gradual process wherein God gives a start and the sinner does the rest. God does it all. 1 Pet. 2:25. Pieper, *Dogmatik*, II, 560. And like Peter's mother-in-law, the converted sinner receives power to serve.

When we see the abundance of God's gifts, we are incited to be rich in good works. We will quit calculating whether we may have done enough good, and we will become liberal and generous. What if it *does* cost more than we expected? What if others *are* not giving what they should? We will be liberal.

2

The other lesson in our text is in verses 40 and 42. The people wanted more miracles and asked Jesus to stay. But He declared that He must go elsewhere and help others. He cannot confine Himself to a few. He must distribute the abundance of His help to many. That is the way God deals with men. He provides abundantly and distributes to all. Ps. 145:15. God also supplies spiritual gifts to all, through His Word and the Sacraments. He cares for the souls of all. 1 Tim. 2:4. Jesus died for all. Salvation is not for a few lucky ones but for all people.

There is another important direction in this incident. The Savior would not stay. He had to go to others. We cannot stay where we want to. It was pleasant on the Mount of Transfiguration, but there was a boy to heal down below, Matt. 17. It was pleasant in the Upper Room, but Gethsemane was waiting. It was pleasant in the home of Mary and Martha, but Jesus had to go to Jerusalem. We cannot always stay where we should like to be. Missionaries — Livingston, Arndt, Naether, and Mohn — knew this. We may wish to stay at home, but there is a church service, voters' meeting, Walther League.

In God's Kingdom there is abundant supply for all, for bodily and spiritual needs. Let us thank God for His blessings, let us be rich in good works.

FREDERIC NIEDNER

Septuagesima

Matt. 5:17-19

Men approach the Scriptures from various points of view. Some consider it one of the sacred books of the East. Others find in it the world's loftiest ethics, the finest literature, the record of the most exemplary Man, etc. But all these views miss the main point when men fail to hear the voice of their God speaking to

them in Scripture. That voice is an earnest voice, meaning every word that has been spoken. For our own benefit

Let Us All Learn to Believe in the Earnestness of Scripture!

1. *It is in earnest on Mount Sinai*
2. *It is in earnest on Mount Calvary*
3. *It is in earnest at the open sepulcher*
- 4. *It is in earnest on the Mount of Olives*

1

The words of Christ in v. 17 are most significant. "I am come to fulfill the Law." The Law, originally written in man's heart (Rom. 2:14, 15), later written on stone tables on Mount Sinai (Ex. 20; Deut. 5), could not be brushed aside. This Law is God's holy will and demands holiness and obedience of men (Lev. 19:2; 11:44a; Matt. 5:48; Gen. 17:1). When Adam and Eve disobeyed God (Gen. 3), the curse of God fell on them and on all their posterity, and death was their lot (Rom. 5:19a, 18a; Deut. 27:26; Gal. 3:10; Rom. 6:23a). Sin made the mind, heart, and will of man wicked (Jer. 17:9). The antediluvian world (Gen. 6:5, 11) and the course of the history of all the nations of the world since then are sufficient proof of the truth of Scripture concerning sin as the source of all human woe (Matt. 15:19; Mark 7:21-23).

Do you all believe Scripture is in earnest when it speaks about the Law and the curse it pronounces on all men? No? Look to Christ, who came to fulfill the Law, v. 17. See Him born under the Law (Gal. 4:4b), made a curse for us (Gal. 3:13b), with all our iniquities resting on Him (Is. 53:6). Hear Him call out on the cross: Matt. 27:46. Believe Scripture when it speaks to you of the terribleness of sin and turn a deaf ear to all who try to minimize or deny sin (vv. 18, 19; John 10:35).

2

Christ says: v. 17. All the prophecies in all the Prophets from Moses to Malachi speak of the Redeemer and point to Mount Calvary, where Jesus, who came to fulfill all the prophecies (Luke 24:25-27), gave up His spirit with the triumphant shout: John 19:30. Christ is the end of the Law (Rom. 10:4) and the propitiation for our sins (1 John 2:2; 4:10; Rom. 3:15; 5:8).

Mount Calvary is foolishness and a stumbling block to many (1 Cor. 1:23), but without the shedding of the blood of the Son of God there is no forgiveness of sin (Heb. 9:22b). Recognize, and believe in, the earnestness of Scripture. Christ came to *fulfill* the Prophets (Matt. 26:39, 42, 44). Brush aside all thoughts, all modern

trends, that would detract from the earnestness of the Cross (1 Cor. 1:18-31). Sing with John Bowring stanza one of "In the Cross of Christ I Glory."

3

Mount Calvary without the open sepulcher would be meaningless. Since Christ came to fulfill all things, vv. 17, 18, death and the grave could not hold Him (Ps. 16:10). According to His own prediction, Christ rose from the dead (Matt. 20:19; 28:1-10; 1 Cor. 15). The open sepulcher is the earnest testimony of Scripture that Christ is the Son of God (Rom. 1:4). His rising from the dead is certain evidence that Job, Simeon, St. Paul, and all the other devout men of God who accepted, and believed in, the earnestness of Scripture attained the hope and end of their faith (Phil. 1:6; 2 Tim. 4:8; Rev. 3:5).

Scripture has not changed its earnestness today when you and I view the open sepulcher. The open sepulcher of the risen Savior, the Conqueror of death and all forces of evil (Ps. 68:18; Col. 3:15), is the reason for believing that Is. 26:19; Ezek. 37:1-15 Dan. 12:2; Phil. 3:21; Rev. 21:4, 10ff.; 22:1-6 will assuredly be fulfilled.

4

Scripture is in earnest, too, when it tells us to teach others concerning Mount Sinai, Mount Calvary, and the open sepulcher, vv. 18, 19. When Scripture says: Matt. 28:19, 20, Scripture means just that. Scripture wants us to witness unto Christ (Acts 1:8) with the Word of Reconciliation on our lips (2 Cor. 18:19). It urges us to preach the Word in season and out of season (2 Tim. 2:4) so that men will be properly equipped for the battle of life (Eph. 6:10-17), will permit nothing to separate them from the love of Christ (Rom. 8:35-39), and will keep their eyes fastened on the everlasting pleasures at the right hand of God (Ps. 16:11; 17:15; 23:6). We can never forget the Mount of Olives and the Word that Jesus spoke there.

Has all this earnestness of Scripture gripped you and drawn you to Jesus? Let the earnest Word of your God take root in your heart and bless you and others. ALEX WM. C. GUEBERT

Sexagesima

John 8:25-36

We are living in a land of liberty. Enumerate the liberties we are enjoying and admonish the hearers gratefully to appreciate and properly to use them. Yet such liberty is not the greatest gift of God. Of the most important and most universally neglected freedom, our Savior speaks in our text.

If the Son Shall Make You Free, Ye Shall Be Free Indeed

1. *Without the Son all men are slaves of sin*
2. *Only the Son can make us free indeed*

1

From the very beginning, v. 25, Jesus had in no uncertain terms by word and deed told the world who He was and why He had come into the world, John 2-8. Today the history of the world, the Church, missions, charity, etc., proves the truth of Jesus' word and claims.

Yet unbelief continues to ask, Who art Thou? v. 25; cp. v. 53c; 10:24. While boasting of their freedom, cp. v. 33, unbelievers are in fact servants of a cruel slave driver; for unbelief is the greatest sin, v. 24; cp. John 16:8, 9. And the unbelieving sinner is a servant, a bondman, a slave, of sin. Sin rules, dominates him, Rom. 6:6, 12-21. Unbelief makes it impossible to accept Christ and His Word, and even to understand it, John 8:27, 43; 1 Cor. 1:18-23; 2:6-8, 14; it twists Christ's words, John 7:34, 35; 8:21 f. Unbelievers to this day slander and vilify Jesus and His vicarious atonement, cp. John 7:20, 35, 44; 8:13, 22, 48, 52 f.; would like to get rid of Jesus and His Gospel, cp. 7:11, 13, 25, 32, 45-53; 8:37, 59. Unbelief, this wicked sin, brings upon man Christ's judgment, v. 26; excludes from God's house, 8:35a; delivers to Satan, 8:44; and everlasting death, v. 24. Slavery indeed!

2

From this slavery the Son alone can make us free, v. 36. There is no restoration of sin-chained man from slavery to sin and Satan to perfect freedom except through Jesus. He alone could carry out successfully the campaign for the liberation of an enslaved world tyrannized by sin. He who calls Himself and proved Himself the great I Am, vv. 24, 58 (cp. Ex. 3:14), who could reveal to the world what He had heard from the Father, v. 26 (cp. 1:18; 3:11-13), tells us that He did nothing of Himself, that His whole life, all His words and deeds, were conformable to a plan devised by His Father for the salvation of the world, v. 28b; Acts 2:23. Hence also the freedom promised by Him was merely a part of the blessings fore-ordained by the Father to be procured by the Son. For this purpose the Father sent Him into the world, v. 26b; John 1:14; a true human being, yet, unlike all other men, holy and sinless, always doing those things that pleased God, v. 29.

This perfect fulfillment of God's Law was an essential part of the liberation He was to accomplish. His vicarious fulfillment of the Law freed man from the necessity of fulfilling the Law in order to be regarded as righteous and worthy to enter heaven.

Christ also tells us that He would be lifted up, v. 28, crucified (cp. John 3:14), also in fulfillment of God's plan as outlined in Is. 53. As our Substitute He took upon Himself our sin and its penalty to free us forever and completely from its guilt, its punishment, its dominion. Here is liberation wrought by the Lord Jehovah Himself; cp. Is. 59:16, 17. And therefore: Is. 54:7-17; 61:1-3. Freedom indeed!

This freedom is proclaimed in His Word, vv. 31, 32, which opens our eyes not only to see our own sinfulness, but also to behold Jesus, our Savior, our Liberator. Let us continue in this Word; then shall we be free indeed and, like the Son, abide as God's free children in the eternal home of freedom indeed opened for all mankind by the Son.

THEO. LAETSCH



Miscellanea

Religious Conditions in New England Around 1800

In a paper entitled "Probationers for Eternity," with the secondary title "Notes on Religion in the United States in the Year 1800," published in the *Harvard Theological Review*, some interesting information is submitted pertaining to conditions in the United States 144 years ago. We quote one paragraph:

"Timothy Dwight went abroad in this New England that year and noted that the inhabitants of Groton (Connecticut) 'are now generally regardless of religion,' and in Newport in September he recorded that, in spite of the number of churches, religion and morals were 'not on a high scale.' Bishop Asbury put in his journal on July 4th, when he was in New Hampshire, that he felt some of the people 'had broken good order and become independent of strict sobriety.' Later that month in Massachusetts he deplored the white steeples and the stalls for horses outside the New England churches, 'Oh, religion in New England!' he wrote, 'will Methodism ever live in such white halls and painted sepulchers as these people?' Good Thomas Robbins in Danbury entered in his diary February 8th: 'Amazing stupidity in all matters of religion prevails in this quarter.' Nor were all signs of disaffection in the North. Jenson observed the Sundays in the Carolinas to be passed in riotousness and drunkenness and noted that the people of Edenton were so far lost to the sense of religion 'that they have suffered a handsome brick Episcopal church, the only place of public worship in town, to fall into decay.'"

The Religion of Primitive Man

A valuable article appearing in the *Watchman-Examiner* of September 21, 1944, and written by George R. Horner, contains a helpful discussion of the religion held and practiced by man in the early dawn of human history. Mr. Horner writes in part:

"According to the evolutionary view of the growth of religion, the lowest rung is called 'animism.' Animism was first promulgated by Sir Edward Tyler in his book *Primitive Culture*. Animism, Tyler says, 'characterizes tribes very low in the scale of humanity, and thence ascends, deeply modified in its transmission, but from first to last preserving an unbroken continuity, into the midst of high modern culture. . . .' Animism is, in fact, the groundwork of the philosophy of religion, from that of savages to that of civilized man. It is, according to Tyler's theory, the first idea primitive man had of a soul, that is, of something different from the body, and was from two groups of biological phenomena: the first, sleep, ecstasy, illness, and death; the second, figures in dreams and appearances in vision, which seemed to present the incorporeal principle, the soul, in isolation. From this beginning of a 'soul' in himself (and other men), it is said he applied it to plants and animals. The next step was ancestor worship, or cult of the dead, in which man revered, through prayers and offerings, the

souls of his ancestors. This was followed by various forms of nature worship: water, trees, beasts, totems (blood relationship with some animal), to polytheism. The final step of monotheism was, according to Tyler, 'by the simple process of raising to divine primacy one of the gods of polytheism itself.'

"This evolutionary interpretation of God is contrary to the Bible in Romans 1:19, 20. 'God is angry; because what may be known about Him is plain to their inmost consciousness; for He Himself made it plain to them. For, from the very creation of the world, His invisible perfections—namely, His eternal power and divine nature—have been rendered intelligible and clearly visible by His words, that they might be without excuse' (Weymouth).

"This revelation of which Paul speaks is the general revelation of God in nature and in man and is objectively present to all men in all times and, *per se*, is not passed into successive cultures. It would not, therefore, be surprising to find evidences of this revelation among primitive cultures in all parts of the world. Let us consider this revelation of God's character as revealed by His attributes.

"Pastor W. Schmidt in his monumental work, *The Origin and Growth of Religion: Facts and Theories* (English translation), demonstrates that the attributes of the Supreme Being are known by the primitives. He gives examples. Concerning God's omniscience, he states that the Batwa Negroes, of Ruanda, say, 'There is nothing which Imana (God) does not know about; He knows everything.' Of God's beneficence, he says that the Wiyot-Maidu Indians of north-central California believe the Old One above bids men pray and tell Him all their troubles. Of God's rewards and punishments many primitives believe that after death there will be a good life for the righteous and a bad one for the evil. The South Andamanese believe the rainbow is the bridge leading to the other world; while the Ainu of northern Japan hold that the fire-goddess presents an accurate account to the Supreme Being of the life of the person on trial. Of God's omnipotency, several southeast Australian tribes say God can go everywhere and do everything; while among North American tribes God is greater than other 'supreme' beings. God's creative ability is expressed in its highest form among the Algonkin Indians, who believe in creation '*ex nihilo*.'

"With regard to revelation in cultural institutions, the evolutionist Frazer (*The Golden Bough*, chapter 37) would have us believe:

The ecstatic frenzies, which were mistaken for divine inspiration, the mangling of the body, the theory of a new birth, and the remission of sins through the shedding of blood, have all their origin in savagery, and they naturally appealed to peoples in whom the savage instincts were still strong. Their true character was indeed often disguised under a decent veil of allegorical or philosophical interpretation, which probably sufficed to impose upon the rapt and enthusiastic worshippers, reconciling even the more cultivated of them to things which otherwise must have filled them with horror and disgust.

"This view is basically antagonistic to the Christian conception of revelation. Besides the general revelation of God in nature and in man, there was a special revelation, as in the fall, the flood, and in the institution of blood sacrifice. Space does not permit us to consider

the fall and the flood at this time, but only the institution of blood sacrifice which was manifest to man in the cradle of civilization. Although we may not be able to place our finger on the time of this divine institution in prehistory, thereby dating this special revelation, we do find survivals of it in many groups. Though these cultures are different from each other, they do have certain elemental traits which can be detected by subtracting the nonessentials which have grown upon each tribe due to isolation. May I repeat that special revelation may be handed down to succeeding generations and to neighboring groups through normal cultural diffusion, or the manner that certain traits are known to posterity. General revelation, *per se*, is an active continuous revelation to all men by God regardless of time and space, and is not transmitted by man either to his children or his neighbors."

A Roman View of Satan's Fall

Before us lies a pamphlet having the title "Neath St. Michael's Shield." It is issued by the Benedictine Convent of Perpetual Adoration, Clyde, Mo. It bears the *nihil obstat* of Stephanus Schappler, O. S. B., Abbas Coadjutor Im. Conceptionis and the "*imprimatur*" of Carolus Hubertus Le Blond, Bishop of St. Joseph. The first edition, issued in 1938, was printed in 30,000 copies. Most amazing information is here submitted to the faithful. After stating that the angels upon their creation were magnificently endowed, but, before being admitted to see God's unveiled glory in heaven, were placed under probation, the author continues, "The end of the trial to which the angels were subjected is not known with certainty. Learned and saintly theologians hold, however, that the heavenly Father revealed to the angels the future incarnation of His own divine Son, whom they were to adore in His sacred humanity. At the same time He revealed to them the surpassing beauty and dignity of Mary, whom as the mother of God they were to venerate as their queen. Lucifer, one of the most glorious and exalted princes of the heavenly court, dazzled by the splendor of the gifts he had received, rebelled at the thought that human nature should be preferred to his own angelic nature. He could not bring himself to acknowledge that a woman inferior to him in nature should at some future time be made his queen and that the Seed of that woman should be preferred to himself for the honor of the hypostatic union. Desiring for himself the prerogatives of the God-man, he raised his great battle cry of rebellion: 'I will be like unto the Most High!' (Is. 14:14.) Enmeshed in this web of pride, one third of the angels joined Lucifer and took up his rebellious cry." Michael, however, so the author continues, was filled with joy and admiration and remained loyal to his Creator. In the battle that followed, described in chap. 12 of the Apocalypse, he and his associates won a glorious victory. Mariolatry evidently is mounting ever higher in the Roman camp.

A.

Theological Observer

"German Protestantism — as the Former Dean of St. Paul's, London, Sees It." — Under this heading the Episcopalian paper *The Churchman* reprints, without comment, from the *Church of England* an attack on Luther and Lutheranism from the pen of Dean W. R. Inge. The article has made the rounds of the press, has been commented upon in our own periodicals, and is perhaps not worth any additional notice. However, it seems necessary periodically to take issue with such examples of dastardly, cowardly, and dishonest criticism. Macbeth, looking on murder, says, "If it were done when 'tis done!" One is tempted to apply the words here. Some lies cannot be killed. There is nothing in this series of indictments that has not been refuted over and over again. What's more, it is impossible that a man of Dean Inge's standing should not know this. The method the writer uses is that of the cheapest rabble rouser, piling one accusation on the other without one single reference to prove his assertions. Here a few examples. The tirade begins:

"If we wish to find a scapegoat on whose shoulders we may lay the miseries which Germany has brought upon the world — not, perhaps, a very scientific way of writing history — I am more and more convinced that the worst evil genius of that country is not Hitler or Bismarck or Frederick the Great, but Martin Luther. This is no indictment of the Reformation, which was quite inevitable in any case. But Lutheranism is essentially German. It has never spread beyond Scandinavia and the Baltic States. In France, Britain, and Holland it gave way to Calvinism, a fine manly creed which leads nations to great prosperity. But as it worships a God who is neither just nor merciful, it is rather stoical than Christian. It is nearly dead now. We are fumbling for a new Reformation and have not yet found it."

Indeed, not a very scientific way of writing history! That Lutheranism is essentially German is as false as that Lutheranism never spread beyond Scandinavia and the Baltic States or that it is nearly dead now; and any textbook of church history might have saved the writer from the one and some study of current church literature from the other misconception. And every Christian (and so every Lutheran) worships a God who is both just *and* merciful. It is to be hoped that Dean Inge soon finds this God; the time is getting short for him.

One of the chief characteristics of Luther's teaching, the writer goes on, is this: "It was anti-humanist." That is not true. I need only mention that Luther's chief co-worker was one of the greatest humanists — Melancthon. Of course, there was a humanism which Luther (as every Christian) opposed; and this critic of Luther himself admits that the Italian Renaissance "looked like a revival of paganism, as indeed it was on one side." The paragraph ends with the statement: "Luther loaded Erasmus with coarse abuse." Does the writer mean to say Luther opposed Erasmus because he was a humanist? That, of course, is not true. Luther very unwillingly had to break with Erasmus because the latter attacked him and his teaching in his diatribe on the free will.

But we cannot let the reference to Luther's "coarse abuse" pass by without comment, though one feels as though he were carrying coal to Newcastle in doing so; so much has been said on that subject. Yet it may be well to point out that in defending Luther on this charge we should not apologize too much. Some do, because Luther occasionally uses language that would be out of place today. But two things should be remembered: first, his language was not offensive at that time. If that had been the case, some of the contemporaries of Luther would have pointed it out at that time; which they did not. It is, of course, a poor excuse to say that others did far worse; but the fact that Luther's language does not compare with the vile productions of Silvester Prierias and of Henry VIII at least proves our point that it was by no means unusual at that time. But, secondly, Luther was engaged in deadly warfare. He was not discussing academic questions with polite gentlemen. He was fighting Antichrist and the powers of darkness, entrenched behind fortifications that had taken centuries to build. And, as someone has said, you can't batter down Gibraltar with a peashooter.

"By making the Atonement and not the Incarnation the central doctrine of Christianity he threw the whole scheme of salvation out of gear. 'The Christ of the Synoptic Gospels,' says Troeltsch, 'made no appeal to him whatsoever. Nor had he any interest in the law of Christ. He makes Paul his doctrinal standard in everything.'

"And what a travesty of Paulinism he gives us! In place of the intense conviction that 'Not I, but Christ liveth in me,' we have a forensic and legalistic theory of 'justification' — that is to say, of righteousness not 'imparted' but 'imputed' vicariously. Faith, which is really a resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis, a venture progressively justified by experience, is for Luther a confident assurance that we are saved by the merits of Christ. Not for him St. Paul's words: 'I count not myself to have apprehended,' nor his fears that after all he might be 'a cast-away'; Luther has no doubts at all that he has been accepted. This is a lamentable impoverishment of the idea of faith and is likely to encourage antinomianism in practice."

Dean Inge evidently subscribes to the words of Troeltsch which he cites and so makes Troeltsch's religious philosophy his own; hence it does not surprise us that he finds a difference between St. Paul's doctrinal standard, the law of Christ, and the Christ of the Synoptic Gospels. The "travesty of Paulinism" is given by Dean Inge; he completely discards everything that St. Paul says on justification — that it is a forensic act of God, that God imputes vicariously the righteousness of Christ — and accepts only what St. Paul says of sanctification; in other words, Dean Inge has no conception at all of God's "scheme of salvation"; there is in his mind a hopeless confusion of justification and sanctification, where St. Paul, and after him Luther, speak very clearly. Not only that, but his own definitions are nebulous and indicate that he has no clear conception in his own mind of what, *e.g.*, faith is: "a resolution to stand or fall by the noblest hypothesis, a venture progressively justified by experience" — what does it mean? With the charge that Luther encourages antinomianism in practice we return to ancient history; the

same charge was made against St. Paul's preaching by the Judaistic teachers of his day and by him brilliantly refuted, as everyone who reads all of St. Paul's letters will discover.

"His teaching about the Holy Communion is grossly materialistic. When asked whether if a mouse ate a crumb of the consecrated bread it would have partaken of the Body of Christ, he replied in the affirmative."

There was a time when Luther was a rabid Papist, as he himself states; in those days he would, of course, answer that question in the affirmative; he believed in Transubstantiation, as all Roman Catholics do. Whether he ever did answer that question in the affirmative I do not know; Dean Inge furnishes no reference; and I have not yet read all of the 87 volumes of the Weimar Edition. But we do know that Luther distinctly rejected the materialistic conception. He said (St. Louis Edition, XX:811): "We poor sinners are not so mad as to believe that Christ's body is in the bread in the crass, visible manner as bread is in the basket or wine in the cup, as the fanatics would like to impute to us, *sich mit unserer Torheit zu kitzeln*." 872: "It is not possible to cut it into pieces, break it, chew it up, digest it." 1032: "No one sees, touches, eats, and chews Christ's body as one visibly sees and chews up other flesh." Did Luther's detractor ever read and study these treatises of Luther? ("*Dass diese Worte noch fest stehen*." "*Luthers Bekenntnis vom Abendmahl Christi*.")

"But the most mischievous part of his teaching was what Troeltsch calls the most characteristic and remarkable tenet in his whole system of ethics, the distinction between public and private morality. The Law of Nature, which ought to be the court of appeal against unjust authority, is identified with the existing order of society, to which absolute obedience is due. 'Joyful acceptance of the world becomes patient endurance of the world.' This interpretation, to quote Troeltsch again, 'glorifies power for its own sake; it therefore glorifies whatever authority may happen to be dominant at any given time. Even when this power is most scandalously abused, its authority still holds good.' This is very much like the notorious doctrine of Machiavelli, and (an Englishman may add) of Hobbes. 'The Greeks and Romans,' said Luther, 'did not know the true Law of Nature. The Tartars (Huns) and people of that kind observed it far better.' He despised the masses and advocated breaking on the wheel, beheading, and torture in dealing with them. Bismarck liked to appeal to Luther for the separation of an external policy of force and an inward piety. By his deification of the Government and of loyal passivity, says Troeltsch, 'he provided a most favorable setting for the development of the territorial State. The only service of Lutheranism to the modern State has been to encourage the spirit of absolutism. Christianity and a Conservative political attitude became identified with each other, as well as piety and a love of power, purity of doctrine, and the glorification of war and the aristocratic standpoint.' 'At the Prussian Restoration in the nineteenth century these ideas were revived; they then produced that blend of masculine hardness and class-conscious ruthlessness which

distinguishes modern Lutheranism.' These are the comments of a German Protestant."

All this is perhaps good Troeltsch, but it is not Luther. While it is true that most governments at that time were monarchies, it cannot even be said that Luther knew no democracies; the free imperial cities had a democratic local government. To compare what Luther taught with "the notorious doctrine of Machiavelli" is simply a historic falsehood for which there is no excuse. Luther's "deification of the Government and of loyal passivity" went exactly as far as the Bible goes, no farther. If Lutheranism produces absolutism, territorialism, glorification of war, and the aristocratic standpoint, why was not that attitude changed in those sections of Germany in which Calvinism displaced Lutheranism and in those which were restored to Catholicism by the Counter Reformation? The Prussian Restoration of the nineteenth century, which revived the idea of absolutism, was led by Calvinists. And it would be difficult to find a greater deification of government than that professed by the first archbishop of Dean Inge's Church; Cranmer's only excuse for his many shiftings under Henry and Edward and his eight recantations under Mary was that he felt conscience-bound to obey the law of his sovereign; and while in the very beginning of his career he had leaned toward Luther, he soon became a Zwinglian and then a Calvinist. No one has ever been able to prove to me that the more democratic form of government in the Netherlands had its source in Calvinism; there this more popular form of government goes back to pre-Reformation times. In short, the causes that controlled the development of government in the various states were not at all, or only in a very small degree, of a religious nature.

Years ago a Lutheran scholar (Prof. Wilhelm Walther of Rostock) took up this oft-repeated charge: Luther taught that absolute obedience is due to the government. Joh. Janssen had made the statement (in his *Geschichte des deutschen Volkes*, Vol. II, 578): Luther preached: Your reason tells you that two and five are seven; but if the government says, two and five are eight, you must believe it in spite of what you know and feel. Professor Walther investigated, wrote to Janssen and others, but neither Janssen nor any of the men who copied from his history had noted the place in Luther's writings where the alleged statement might be found; they had to confess that they had copied it from a *Deutsche Kultur- und Sittengeschichte*, written by Joh. Scherr (3d ed., p. 260). But Scherr gave no reference either, and when asked where he found it, he (after some prodding) answered that he had forgotten; besides, he did not have Luther's works at hand to look for them. Walther knew Luther's writings better; he knew where to find this citation, too, in one of his sermons (St. Louis ed., X:1095); only Luther does not say: If the government says, two and five are eight; Luther says: If *He from above* should say, No, they are eight. He is speaking of the mystery of the Holy Trinity, absolutely unfathomable by reason; but since God says so, I believe it. Government isn't mentioned in the respective paragraph nor anywhere in the context. (See Wilhelm Walther, *Fuer Luther wider Rom*, p. 398 f.) — The chal-

lenge remains: Where did Luther ever say that we owe absolute obedience to the government?

Any attack on Luther would be incomplete without reference to Philip of Hesse's bigamy. So here:

"His admiration for the Old Testament led him to appeal to old Hebrew morals to excuse the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse."

Luther did admire the Old Testament, and he admired the New Testament; both were to him the Word of God. Luther never "excused" the bigamy of the Landgrave of Hesse; he always regarded it as the lesser of two evils. In that whole affair one may well differ with Luther. But to insinuate that Luther sanctioned, even favored, polygamy is nothing less than abominable dishonesty.

The document concludes:

"There is very little to be said for this coarse and foul-mouthed leader of a revolution. It is a real misfortune for humanity that he appeared just at the crisis in the Christian world. Even our burly Defender of the Faith was not a worse man and did far less mischief. We must hope that the next swing of the pendulum will put an end to Luther's influence in Germany."

Nothing that I could say would show Dean Inge in a worse light than his own concluding paragraph. Such language judges itself and its writer.

THEO. HOYER

Luther. — "Three centuries ago the power of the German mind shook the Church and the States of Christendom to their lowest foundation. The need of a reformation, which had long before been prepared in different ways, in the most profound and noble minds, awoke with concentrated force in the bosom of an humble and conscientious, yet gigantic monk of Wittenberg, and worked itself out to a clear conviction. He was chosen by Providence to be the oracle of the times, to be the leader of all who longed for deliverance from the fetters of the second Egyptian bondage. Just such a man was needed—one who did not lightly take upon himself the responsible work of reform; who was not filled with empty dreams of liberty; who, in destroying the superstition which had gathered around the faith, would not destroy the faith itself; but who by painful experience was acquainted with the entire system, whose fetters he was destined to break; who, with all the energy of a faithful and obedient monk, had struggled to obtain salvation through the ordinances of medieval Catholicism. He possessed therefore the indispensable requisites of a genuine reformer—an experimental knowledge of the church which was to be reformed, and a deep religious earnestness, which sought not for distinction, but which labored only for the glory of God and the salvation of men. . . . I need not mention the name of *Luther*; it is on everyone's tongue. He needs no monument—a eulogy would be too late. The history of three centuries tells us what he was; Protestantism is his indestructible monument." —*Bibliotheca Sacra*, August, 1847. On account of the dastardly attack of Dean Inge on the Reformer, our brethren will not fault us for reprinting this old estimate of Luther which was reproduced in a recent issue of *Bibliotheca Sacra*.

A.

Ethical Education Without the Basis of Bible Doctrine.—Prof. O. C. Rupprecht of our Concordia College, Milwaukee, Wis., who in the December, 1944, issue of this journal reviewed the book of C. H. Moehlman: *School and Church: the American Way*, writes us briefly on the position some educational leaders take on the un-Biblical views voiced by Mr. Moehlman.

"One of the most vigorous denunciations of educational leaders who harbor this sort of blithe optimism as to the power of purely ethical training appeared, ironically enough, in another Harper publication of this year (*The Predicament of Modern Man*, by D. E. Trueblood). In Chapter Three ('The Impotence of Ethics'), Dr. Trueblood asks: 'What is going to buttress our spiritual life in this time of unparalleled danger, when the ancient supports are gone? . . . Is it some general talk about the democratic way of life?' (P. 25.) He answers: 'Here is our predicament: We have inherited precious ethical convictions that seem to us to be profound, central, and essential. But they have a curious inefficacy. *They are noble, but they are impotent.*' (Author's italics.) 'It is clear that something more is needed, that moral convictions, while necessary to the good life, are not sufficient' (p. 51 f.). 'We are now trying the utterly precarious experiment, in which the odds are against us, of attempting to maintain our culture by loyalty to the Christian ethic without a corresponding faith in the Christian religion that produced it' (p. 53 f.). 'The terrible danger of our time consists in the fact that ours is a *cut-flower civilization.*' (Author's italics.) 'Beautiful as cut flowers may be, and much as we may use our ingenuity to keep them looking fresh for a while, they will eventually die, and they die because they are severed from their sustaining roots' (p. 59).

"In England, Sir Richard Livingstone, President of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, has recently issued the same warning in almost the identical words. 'We are living on character formed in the past by beliefs which are now shaken or destroyed. . . . Lord Bryce was once asked: "What do you think would be the effect of the disappearance of religious education from the schools?" "I can't answer that," he replied, "till three generations have passed." . . . A plant may continue in apparent health for some time after its roots have been cut, yet its days are numbered. . . . Rootless virtues are precarious. But how strong are the roots of our virtues? . . . We are left with traditions and habits of conduct inherited from them (our parents), as the earth may for a time still receive light from an extinct star. But that light will not continue to shine, nor can these habits and traditions long survive the beliefs from which they grew. Those who reject Christian beliefs cannot count on keeping Christian morals.' (*On Education*, Part II, p. 24 f. Macmillan, New York, 1944.)"

A.

The Lutheran on the Doctrinal Affirmation.—The Doctrinal Affirmation of the American Lutheran Church and the Missouri Synod is now being studied by the Lutheran churches in our country, but not by all, we are afraid, with that interest which the document merits. In fact, there are some which are absolutely opposed to any more confessions and demand church union on the basis of the received Lutheran Con-

fessions, especially the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism. The *Lutheran* (Nov. 15, 1944), after having discussed the contents of the Doctrinal Affirmation, closes its editorial with the remarks: "Wherein it agrees with the positions expressed by the historic confessions of Lutherans, it is unnecessary. Where it injects new ideas into the tenets of our church, it creates conclusions either ambiguous or out of accord with the Book of Concord." Perhaps the reference is to the doctrine of inspiration, the infallibility and sole authority of Holy Scripture, but these very doctrines form the foundation upon which our historic Lutheran Confessions rest. The negative view expressed in the *Lutheran* is certainly not in the interest of true church unity, and we are sure that the editorial does not represent the opinion of all its readers. The truth of God's Word most assuredly must be so dear to us that for its sake we are willing to spend on it our best time and talent. The Doctrinal Affirmation presents to the Lutheran Church in America an opportunity that should be welcomed by all of us.

J. T. M.

Baptists on the Horns of a Dilemma.—Under the heading *Our Confessional Dilemma*, George J. Carlson, in *The Watchman-Examiner* (August 31, 1944), directs the attention of his readers to the fact that Baptists both deny and assert that they have a "Confession of Faith." He denies that the Baptists have a creed, that is, "a dogma that was formulated after long deliberation by theological and church councils and possesses complete ecumenical sanction." In contradistinction to creeds he defines a "confession of faith" as "the expressed belief of many Christians drawn up and drafted by one individual, or several, and given wide but unsubscribed acceptance." A creed is "static," while a "confession of faith need not be." He explains further: "The Baptist method is always contemporaneous, and its very method demands that there shall be frequent, new, purposeful redefining of its historic position. So long as Baptists continue in this method they will avoid the decadence of the past [sic!] and will avoid the destructive changes of modernism, a tree doomed because it has too large a vegetation and too little root [Is that all to be said against modernism?]. Among the various "Confessions of Faith" prevalent in Baptist circles the writer mentions the following: The Confession of Balthasar Hubmaier (Waldshut, 1524), the Anabaptist Confession (Augsburg, 1526), the Confession prepared by a General Synod (Augsburg, 1527), the Schleithem Confession of Faith (1527), the Confession of Seven Churches in London (1644), the Confession of Somerset, England (1656), the Confession of 1689 (London), Keach's Catechism (1693, based on the above Confession), the Philadelphia Confession (1742, a confession adopted by the Philadelphia Association and based on the London Confession), the Philadelphia Confession adopted by the Warren Association in Rhode Island (1767), the Philadelphia Confession adopted in New England (1800), the Concise Statement of Belief, adopted by the Central Association of Vermont (1824), the Seventeen Articles, adopted by the Eastern Maine Association (1825), the New Hampshire Confession of Faith (1833), the Revision of the New Hampshire Confession (1853), Baptist, Why and Why Not (1900), etc. Over against this long list of confessions, to

which others might be added, the American Baptist Foreign Mission Society stated in a pamphlet published in 1943: "The adoption of a doctrinal statement for such use (to interpret the evangelical policy) would be a departure from the *historic Baptist position*, to which our denomination has consistently adhered. The Northern Baptist Convention has repeatedly refused to make normative any confession of faith or creedal statements beyond the affirmation adopted at the Indianapolis Convention in 1922, to wit: The Northern Baptist Convention affirms that the New Testament is the all-sufficient ground of our faith and practice and we need no other statement." "The next 'official' statement (the writer continues) is found in the Northern Baptist Convention *Pastors' News Letter*, under date of January 7, 1944. The title of this statement reads: 'Pastors Urged to Stress Historic Baptist Principles on Denominational Sunday, February 6, 1944.' Then follows the statement: 'Now is a good time to re-educate our people in regard to fundamental Baptist principles.'" Among these "fundamental Baptist principles" the following are mentioned: Separation of Church and State, Religious Freedom, a Regenerated Church Membership, the Priesthood of All Believers, the Bible as the Sole Authority of Belief and Practice. In conclusion the writer says: "Baptists have had a confession of belief that has been normative for their fellowship and the means of loyalty and unity through the years. Now we are on the horns of a dilemma, both denying and asserting that we have a 'Confession of Faith.' Not one of the confessions presented and subscribed to during the years has been abrogated. Our Publication Society, our periodicals, our histories, and our Convention Societies are still presenting 'Confessions of Faith' which are Baptist, some presenting a positive side, while others present a negative side, stating that which is not Baptist. Greater clarification is needed." The tragic confusion here described, in spite of the endless multiplication of confessions of faith, is due to the refusal of Baptists to bind themselves permanently to definite creeds or, as the writer puts it, to "the Baptist method that there shall be frequent, new, purposeful redefining of its historic position." In this way ever new confessions of faith are brought into existence, which, however, carry no weight. Lutheranism has avoided this mistake by permanently adopting the ancient ecumenical creeds and the particular Lutheran confessions which became necessary as a witness against the errors of Romanism, Calvinism, and enthusiasm in general, in connection with the Reformation. To Lutherans, fully aware of the issues involved, the Concordia of 1580 is exceedingly precious as a means of making for and preserving spiritual unity among the groups that claim the Reformer's name. While thus holding to definite permanent confessions, Lutheranism is wary of new confessions. Should such become necessary, it looks upon them as supplementing the already adopted confessions, in order that on matters in controversy, which have arisen since 1580, the various Lutheran groups may see eye to eye. Such supplementary confessions should therefore receive careful consideration and, if agreement can be reached, should be adopted. Doctrinal unity is certainly worth the most painstaking efforts on this score. The con-

fusion prevailing among Baptists, as pointed out in the article quoted in part, presents a warning that should not be ignored. The question underlying the entire problem is: "How greatly do we value the divine truth?"

J. T. M.

An Un-American Marriage.—It is gratifying to Protestants that Benjamin Lotz in *The Christian Century* (Nov. 15, 1944), under the given heading, has added his protest to those of others against the "ante-nuptial agreement, to be signed by the non-Catholic party in a mixed marriage" before having the wedding solemnized by the priest. The matter is presented in a very clever, objective, and effective way. John Parkridge desires to marry a Catholic young lady, called Jane. She tells him that he must go to instruction before they can be married. He complies. Father Murphy is very diplomatic and discreet, but step by step he leads John into closer intimacy with the Catholic doctrine and finally asks him to sign the "ante-nuptial agreement." John, in great consternation, takes the document to his Protestant pastor, who points out to him some of the implications of the pledge which had escaped John's notice. "Jane is to work for your conversion. But there is no such reciprocal right accorded to you. The Roman Catholic Church denies you what it requires for Jane and demands that you acquiesce in this demand. This attitude is undemocratic and un-American because it is essentially unfair," and so forth. What John will do, is not reported; at any rate, he has been instructed, and that is the important thing. The solution which the writer suggests to solve the problem cannot be accepted by confessional Christians. What he advocates is the "building of a common faith through a better understanding of God's Word. It would be a religion born of God's spirit and God's truth." What that means seems to be the building of a syncretistic religion which ignores the doctrinal differences existing between Roman Catholics and Protestants. But what we can do is to follow the procedure outlined in a resolution adopted by the U. L. C. A. at its last convention, to wit: "The United Synod of New York has taken notice of the demand of the Roman Catholic Church that the children of mixed marriages shall be pledged to the Roman Catholic Church. It requested 'the U. L. C. A. to instruct its Executive Board of Social Missions to prepare and distribute a statement informing and advising our Lutheran youth as to the pre-marital, contractual requirements of the Roman Catholic Church concerning the upbringing of children resulting from mixed marriages between Roman Catholics and our youth.'" In fact, already many of our churches are acquainting their young people with the Roman Catholic "ante-nuptial agreement," informing them at the same time that if they sign the agreement, they thereby deny the Lutheran faith and their duty of confessing the truth of the Gospel.

J. T. M.

The Need for Theology.—In *The Watchman-Examiner* (Sept. 7, 1944) Dr. C. S. Roddy points out that "we find in the churches today a growing interest in theology and with that interest an increasing demand that theology occupy a larger place in the content of the preacher's message." Throughout, the article is an urgent plea for more theology in the Church. He even pleads for creeds. He writes:

"In their denial [the creed-opposing groups' repudiation of creeds] they are compelled by logical necessity to announce a creed. 'I do not believe in creeds' is but an affirmation of belief — which is a creed — in a negative form. Creeds and theology will cease to be only when man ceases to be man." After a lengthy discussion of the essence of Christian theology, Dr. Roddy (who has just closed his ministry as pastor of the Baptist Temple, Brooklyn, N. Y., to join the faculty of the Eastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Philadelphia, as professor of the English Bible) insists on *preaching* theology. He writes: "Having seen the necessity for theology and having found the heart of our Christian theology, the question arises — how shall we preach it? As to method, I would say that we can follow the example of Dr. Dale of England and deliberately preach doctrinal sermons. A series of doctrinal sermons on the great truths of the Church, such as sin, repentance, faith, God, Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit, man, atonement, regeneration, sanctification, the second coming, heaven, and hell, cannot fail to bless both the preacher and the people. Such an orderly presentation is of much greater value than the hit or miss system, or rather lack of system, of just indirectly mentioning a subject in any kind of sermon. Such a preaching of theology is in harmony with the principle of teaching, conforming to the laws under which the mind operates. Also our people ought to know the Bible meaning of those great terms. Today we find altogether too loose a use of those great words. This is due to shallow thinking and a careless regard for the logical rules of definition. The result has been vagueness in thought, with resultant confusion in living. Positive living can only arise from positive preaching, which can only come from clear apprehension of truth, which in turn is the result of clear thinking. Therefore 'let us gird the loins of our minds,' as Peter puts it, meditate within the eternal truth, and preach doctrinal sermons. After all, for what else are we behind the sacred desk [pulpit]? Are we not prophets — those who speak the Word of God? The history of the Christian Church from Paul to Augustine, to Luther, to Calvin, to Wesley, to Edwards, to Finney, to Spurgeon, to Moody — is it not but the record of doctrinal preaching? Who follows in their train? Some may do what Phillips Brooks was master of — preach theology without labeling it for your people. 'Fill your sermons with theology and more theology' was his advice to young preachers. Personally, I cannot see how, if you preach at all, you can avoid preaching theology. The question really becomes: 'Is it good or bad theology; is it poorly or clearly presented?' There is another method which I am constrained to believe is the ideal — expository preaching. What a pity we have neglected it in our American pulpit. What a price we have paid. God bring us back. Try to expound the Word of God and not 'preach theology.' Let us have a generation of thoughtful expository preaching, and we will change the whole character of the Church." When Dr. Roddy says: "Try to expound the Word of God and not preach theology" (the single quotation marks are our own to bring out the import of his words), he means, of course, that if a minister rightly expounds the Word of God, he must of necessity "preach theology." For us Lutherans the subject has a very definite interest. In the past our

congregations were accustomed to the "preaching of theology." But has there not been a decided yielding on this point in recent years in our circles? Have not our sermons, in many cases at least, lacked both in depth and comprehensiveness of textual treatment? In stressing the central doctrines, have we made clear to our hearers their full meaning, and have we properly related them to the other doctrines with which they stand in close connection? Again, have we preached "all the counsel of God" (Acts 20:27)? Have we, for example, treated rightly and fully the so-called "forgotten doctrines," such as the personal union of the two natures in Christ, predestination, the importance of the means of grace, in particular, of the Sacraments, absolution, and the like? There has not been in recent years, we fear, that full and complete exposition of the Christian doctrines which we find in the sermons of our founding fathers. Times certainly change and with them methods and approaches. But the great commission of Christ always stands, and we are to teach men "to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you" (Matt. 28:20). When Dr. Roddy writes: "Therefore, 'study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing the Word of truth'" (2 Tim. 2:15), this applies also to our ministry of witnessing Christ to the world.

J. T. M.

Unionism Worse than Sectarianism.—The unification plans of the Evangelical and Reformed Churches and the Christian and Congregational Churches seem to be progressing. The commission of these two groups has agreed upon a name if and when the merger is effected: The United Church of Christ. We are unable to understand how this merger can really eventuate in a real union. Not only is the historical and cultural background of the two groups vastly different, but it seems to us that the theological position would offer an unbridgeable barrier. The former Evangelical Synod accepted the Lutheran and the Heidelberg Catechisms, the Reformed Church only the latter. We feel that these two groups could unite without many conscience scruples. But the Christian Churches were Unitarian and thoroughly anti-creedal since their beginning around 1800, and in recent decades the Congregationalists took a similar position. What position will the United Church of Christ occupy? Walther: "The unionistic bodies imperil the Church more than the worst sect, for the worst sect at least acknowledges that nothing but the pure truth *ought* to be taught. But unionism stands for the pernicious principles that man can never find and possess the pure truth and that, consequently, contending for the truth is wrong." *Epistel Postille*, p. 77.

F. E. M.

Another Interchurch Conference.—Under the heading "Second Interchurch Conference" the *Living Church* publishes an editorial giving information on the planned conference. In order that our readers may be informed, we reprint the editorial.

"Non-Roman Christian Leaders of the United States will hold their second 'peace conference' in three years at Cleveland, January 16 to 19, 1945, to appraise the results of Dumbarton and other peace parleys and determine a course of action to achieve their goal of a just and durable peace based on spiritual principles.

"The guiding principles were adopted by the first conference, held at Delaware, Ohio, in March, 1942. These were supplemented by the political propositions, or Six Pillars of Peace, promulgated two years ago by the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, sponsor of both conferences. The Commission was instituted three years ago by the Federal Council of Churches.

"In the light of these Church pronouncements the delegates to the Cleveland conference, representing most leading non-Roman communions, will study the developments of the last three years on the peace front. These include the pronouncements of the United Nations at Teheran, Moscow, Cairo, and Dumbarton, and the Connally and Fulbright resolutions passed by the two houses of the United States Congress.

"The leadership of the Churches has been concerned that the United States and other United Nations move in the direction of a world organization that will have both curative and creative, not merely repressive, responsibilities. Through the Commission they advised the government that in their judgment this is the only kind of peace the Christian forces of the nation can accept. At the same time they urged their people not to be discouraged by particular settlements, but to continue to press for world organization consonant with their ideals.

"The conference will study both the international situation and the basic peace strategy of the Churches. It is expected to adopt findings and recommendations for consideration of the Churches and public leaders. The recommendations of the conference will be submitted to the governing bodies of the Churches.

"To facilitate the work of the conference it was announced that two study commissions would be created. One will study the current international situation; the other, the basic problem of the peace strategy of the Churches. They will be urged to complete their work of drafting a statement and recommendations before December 15th, so that all delegates will have an opportunity to study them in advance of the convening date of the conference.

"The personnel of these two commissions will be announced soon.

"Between 350 and 400 delegates are expected to attend the conference, and two thirds of them will represent various communions, within and without the Federal Council of Churches, which, itself, has a constituency of 25,000,000. Other groups which will be represented are: Allied Christian bodies such as the Home Missions Council, Foreign Missions Conference, International Council of Religious Education, American Committee for the World Council of Churches and the United Stewardship Council; Christian bodies conducting educational programs for World Order, such as the Church Peace Union, YMCA, YWCA, United Council of Church Women, American Friends Service Committee, American Section of the World Alliance for International Friendship Through the Churches, Laymen's Missionary Movement, Laymen's Movement for World Christianity, Interseminary Movement and the United Christian Youth Movement, City and State Councils of Churches, members of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, which includes more than 100 Church leaders, clergymen and laymen of various communions.

"The Associated Church Press will be invited to send a limited

number of delegates, and the representatives of the press, secular and religious, will be invited to the conference." Will true peace be promoted by the projected efforts? Will the cause of the saving Gospel be helped or hindered? These are some of the anxious questions we ask.

A.

Hutchins vs. Dewey.—In the *Christian Century* (Nov. 15, 1944) Pres. Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago measures swords with Prof. John Dewey and attacks the latter's worship of science. We quote some of the salient paragraphs.

"The essence of Mr. Dewey's position is that only science is knowledge; everything else is out of date. History, philosophy, theology, religion, art, and literature—almost everything, in short, that makes life worth living—are irrelevant and have, so far as it appears, no place in modern education.

"Science has given us a world that is in many respects new. It has placed in our hands a control over nature of which our grandfathers could not have dreamed. The direction of this enormous power is the most pressing problem of modern man. This power has been used for the degradation, the enslavement and the mechanization of millions throughout the world. It is now being employed on the grandest scale in history for the extermination of mankind. The task of the subordination of science and technology to human ends is the great task before us. Why such subordination should be regarded as anti-scientific or reactionary must remain an impenetrable mystery. Man should have every instrument to achieve his ends; and the greatest of these is science. Man should have clear and humane ends; and to clarify his ends and make them appropriate to humanity he needs philosophy and religion." . . . "The faith of our fathers makes a place for philosophy and science. The faith of John Dewey leaves no place for philosophy or religion. And the remarkable part of it is that Mr. Dewey, in addition to his failure to show any reason why we should accept his revelation, fails to suggest why it should compel us to abolish philosophy and religion. We do not say you must give up science if you believe in God. Mr. Dewey says you must give up philosophy and religion or you cannot truly believe in science. He requires us not merely to have faith in science, but to have faith in nothing else.

"If we follow the road marked out by Mr. Dewey, we may increase our wealth; we may lengthen our lives; we may gain complete mastery over nature; we may ultimately reach that engineer's paradise which Francis Bacon dreamed of four hundred years ago. But we shall find that technology is not a substitute for justice; we shall not know what to do with our lives; we shall not know how to live with ourselves; and we shall discover at the last that the machine has enslaved us all."

A.

The Roman Menace.—In the *Lutheran* of October 4, on the page edited by G. Elson Ruff, we find the following paragraph:

"The watchful eyes of Protestants are rather constantly on the Roman Catholics lest some unfair advantage may be seized when no one is looking. There has been a good bit of talk among some of the Protestant chaplains that Roman Catholic clergymen have edged in

unduly in their work among servicemen. One event attracting considerable attention in church circles was the resignation of Lt. H. W. Van Delinder as a chaplain in the United States Maritime Service, 'in protest of the religious discrimination against Protestants made more and more evident in the chaplain corps of the merchant marine.' Mr. Van Delinder, a Presbyterian, claimed that a disproportionately large number of Roman Catholic chaplains had been appointed at the Cadet Basic School at San Mateo, Calif., more than fifty per cent to minister to a corps of which only approximately 25 per cent of the cadets were Roman Catholics. He further charged that Roman Catholic chaplains demanded rights for themselves which are not granted to Protestant chaplains, such as requiring the Protestant cadet-midshipmen to visit Roman Catholic chaplains when no Protestant chaplain is available, but protesting if Roman Catholic cadet-midshipmen visited a Protestant chaplain. Merchant marine authorities state that they find Mr. Van Delinder's charges to be largely false. However, the resigning chaplain has stated his grievance, saying that Senior Chaplain Madden at San Mateo had ordered that all Protestants must be addressed by a Catholic chaplain before interviewing a Protestant chaplain. The *Witness* (Episcopal weekly), which prints the story, says that the favored assignments and the superior publicity given the work of the Romanist chaplains creates the impression 'that the Roman Catholic Church is performing a more effective pastoral job than the Protestant chaplains. Four Episcopal clergymen of Missouri recently issued a similar statement, charging that 'the Roman Catholic Church is using every modern mechanism—publicity, political pressure, and aggressive missionary technique—to forward the cause of Roman Catholicism in the army forces.'

We add to the above another paragraph from the *Lutheran*, written by Julius F. Seebach, "The Baptists of Toronto think that Canada needs to organize a Protestant political party. Dr. T. T. Schields, their spokesman, asserts the proposal carries no significance of religious rancor, adding: 'I would oppose to the death any movement which would curtail a Roman Catholic's liberty as a religionist. I abhor his religion and believe him to be utterly wrong; but I would fight to the end to defend his right to be wrong, if he wants to be wrong.' However—'Cardinal Villeneuve is doing the work of Laval and Petain in Canada. Villeneuve rules Quebec, and Quebec rules Canada through Mackenzie King.' This is just one note sounding the alarm that makes Protestants conscious everywhere that all is not well for their faith in the political world."

A.

Encouraging Our Five Million Dollar Postwar Service Collection.—

There is no need here to describe in detail the project of our Church to raise a peace offering of five million dollars for postwar service work, for already the informative literature is in the hands of our pastors and congregations. But it may encourage us in this blessed enterprise to know that other denominations have at the present juncture experienced an unusual willingness on the part of their members to contribute both for general and special church purposes. *The Christian Advocate* (Oct. 12, 1944), for example, has this to report on liberal giving for the

Methodist Crusade for Christ: "So far as *The Christian Advocate* is able to discover, Seth Painter, a local preacher of Monroeville, Ind., serving as the supply pastor of a two-point rural charge in the Fort Wayne District of the North Indiana Conference, has taken first place. When the plans for the Crusade for Christ first reached him, Seth Painter was profoundly stirred. The 218 members of his two churches, Pleasant Mills and Salem, did not have to be organized on an elaborate scale. About all that was necessary was to present the cause and take the collection. And he did just that. The result? On September 19 he sent his district superintendent, Rev. William W. Robinson, a check for \$915.60, payment in full. This is an average of \$4.20 per member. 'I just told the people about it, and they gave the money,' is Seth Painter's explanation." There is something strangely inspiring in the simple report: "I just told the people about it, and they gave the money." Just so, many another pastor of our own Church has simply told his people about the needs of the Lord, and they cheerfully and often far beyond expectations have supplied the necessary funds. The same paper reports of another Methodist church, with a membership of 660, all in the middle- and low-salary bracket, which during the last year contributed for others an average of \$26.22 per member and for their own local church expenses an average of \$19.05 per member, or a total of \$29,878.20. The editorial says: "The explanation of this remarkable record—\$45.27 per member—is the fact that this church makes a specialty of tithing, and a large percentage of the people bring one tenth of their income into the treasury of their own church." Fears have been expressed as to whether our people are ready to contribute the funds necessary for the planned church expansion; but, unless adverse conditions prevail, all that will be necessary is "to present the cause and take the collection." The very faith of Christian believers makes them cheerful givers.

J. T. M.

Canada's Family Allowance Act.—It may be well for our pastors to have knowledge of recent legislation in Canada, written about by a correspondent of the *Christian Century* for November 15, 1944. The correspondence is dated November 2.

"The Canadian Parliament before adjournment last summer passed the Family Allowance Act, which will begin operation July 1, 1945. This act provides for monthly allowances for all children up to the age of 16, according to the following scale: children under six years, \$5 a month; children six to ten, \$6 a month; children 11 to 13, \$7 a month; children 14 to 16, \$8 a month. These rates are to be reduced by \$1 a month for the fifth child in a family; by \$2 for the sixth and seventh children; by \$3 for the eighth child and any additional children.

"It is estimated that there are in Canada 3,450,000 children under 16 years of age and that the annual cost of the allowance plan will be \$200,000,000. The plan is designed to aid low-income families, particularly those below income-tax levels. Income-tax payers have been receiving a tax exemption of \$9 per month for each dependent child. This exemption remains, but the family allowance granted to such families will be reduced by the amount of the tax exemption

already allowed. It is further contended that the act will stabilize employment in postwar years by increasing the purchasing power of low-income families. While there had been considerable controversy, particularly in Progressive-Conservative quarters, the vote was unanimous." A.

Brief Items.—Dr. E. M. Jellinek, who is at the head of the department of alcoholic studies in Yale University, declares that alcoholism has become "America's public health problem number four." According to his statistics, there are three million excessive drinkers in the United States.

Statistics of British Churches, released by the British Information Service, credit the Church of England with 3,380,859 members; the Roman Catholic Church in England and Wales with 1,975,489; the Church of Scotland with 1,278,297; the Methodist Church with 797,706; Baptist, 382,337; Congregational, 416,442; Presbyterian Church of England, 76,815; Presbyterian Church of Wales, 175,036; Unitarian, 30,000. This report appeared in the *Christian Century* of October 4. Is not the number of members of the Church of England far lower than most of us had imagined it to be?

In 1856 Swedish Lutheran missionaries were sent to Abyssinia and worked there with great success. After a sad interruption the work will be resumed; twenty missionaries will be sent into that territory, who will be joined by eight of their brethren who had been working in the region of Tanganyika. A.



Book Review

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis 18, Mo.

Scripture Cannot be Broken. Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture. By Dr. Th. Engelder. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 498 pages, 6½×9½. \$3.00.

In view of the controversy on the inerrancy of the Scripture which during the last fifty years or so has been in progress in Protestant circles here in America and for a number of years has been troubling the Lutheran camp, too, the appearance of the volume before us is extraordinarily timely. What Dr. Engelder, our esteemed and well-beloved colleague, seeks to defend is precisely the precious truth which is under attack, that everything in the Bible is God-given and without error. The contents of this stately volume were published as serial articles in the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY from April, 1941, to December, 1942. The caption used for these articles was "Verbal Inspiration—a Stumbling-Block to the Jews and Foolishness to the Greeks." For the book the shorter and more convenient title given above was chosen. If the question is asked, Why republish what has appeared in a journal? the answer is that requests for such republication in book form were voiced both inside and outside Missouri Synod circles, and that the articles are so valuable in furnishing our clergy useful material in combating a prevalent error that they ought to be at a pastor's elbow for ready reference and study.

The author indicates the scope of the volume in the subtitle "Six Objections to Verbal Inspiration Examined in the Light of Scripture." These objections are: 1. The Bible contains errors; 2. It is marred by moral blemishes; 3. It deals in trivialities; 4. Verbal inspiration is mechanical inspiration; 5. It implies an atomistic conception and use of Scripture; 6. It means the establishment of the legalistic authority of the letter. These six points are examined with great thoroughness. The arguments of the critics are presented in their own words, and then follows the refutation—definite, annihilating. Careful documentation is one of the strong points of the work. The book is written with genuine warmth. *Pectus facit theologum*, we say, and that the heart of the author is speaking here and not merely his head one will soon perceive. It is not an amiable afternoon-tea discussion which is here conducted, in which no excitement is noticeable because the subject is inconsequential. What is defended is a divine truth of high significance to the children of God, and the author will not stand by while it is crushed.

The book has the charm which is characteristic of all of Dr. Engelder's writing. With absolute clarity of presentation, which betokens that the subject has really been mastered, there is coupled a special flavor, a felicity of expression, an occasional refreshing humorous sally, which fascinate and show that the writer, while intensely serious, still is really human.

What will strike everybody at once and what makes the book a veritable mine of information is the great number of quotations embodied here. The author has read most widely, and what he has found in books and magazines, new and old, pertaining to the subject, he submits to us. Let the reader look at the elaborate index to convince himself of the host of authors adduced.

Will the book be read and studied? For the sake of our dear Church and her future, we hope it will. Not by a mere repeating of traditional slogans can we hope to keep this and the next generation loyal to the divine Scriptures, but only by a careful study of all the points of doctrine involved, so that both the attacks on the Scriptures and the proper manner of meeting them become familiar to us.

W. ARNDT

The Doctrine of the Trinity. By Leonhard Hodgson. Charles Scribner's Sons. 237 pages, 5¼×8¼. \$2.50.

Here is a book which has been favorably reviewed both in England and America, and there is indeed much to say in favor of it. In the first place, it is a very profound treatise of the doctrine of the Trinity, and that in itself is rather a novelty in modern theological circles, which for many decades have so steadfastly refused to take Christian theology seriously that they have avoided all lengthy discussions of Christian doctrine. In the second place, it is a very learned and positive study of the subject. Dr. Hodgson is regius professor of divinity in the University of Oxford and canon of Christ Church, and his book presents the Croall Lectures, delivered at Edinburgh in January, 1943. They bear the following titles: Revelation as the Source of Doctrine; The Revelation in the New Testament (2 chapters); Trinitarian Theology; The Doctrine and Philosophy: Three Classical Expositions: Augustine, Aquinas, Calvin; Trinitarian Religion, the last a practical application of the doctrine. Eight appendices add valuable illustrative historical material and an index makes it easy for a student to locate such topics as he desires to consider. The whole book challenges the reader to careful study and thoughtful reflection, as practically every statement supplies him with rich theological data. Finally, the author wishes to defend the traditional doctrine of the Church as this is set forth in the *Quicunque Vult* and other creeds, as also in the Litany of the Book of Common Prayer and in the various church hymns. To the reviewer it was interesting to find that Dr. Hodgson supports his own view (recently presented in the *CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY* in an article on the Theology of Crisis) that Karl Barth does not regard the three Persons of the Godhead as Persons in the full sense of the word, but suggests that what are commonly called "Persons" would better be called three "modes of existence" of the one God. Dr. Hodgson considers this surprising, since Barth claims to be a Biblical theologian, expounding Biblical doctrine. Yet the writer need not be surprised, for Barth is not a Biblical theologian, but an exponent of a new philosophy based on fundamentals of Calvinism. Hodgson, however, is himself not a Biblical theologian, but an exponent of a new approach to traditional doctrine adapted to modern thinking. He indeed propounds that

revelation is the source of the doctrine of the Trinity, but to him revelation does not mean what it does to the orthodox believer, namely, the inspired Word of God, teaching propositions that are to be believed because of its very divine authority. To Hodgson, Scripture is not a divine book at all in the orthodox sense, but a human book containing the reactive reasoning of men to God's self-revelation in history. The *revelatum* was not by direct word, but by deed; and what certain men, endowed with psychological predispositions to appreciate this gift of God, have recorded forms our present Scriptures. However, the divine revelation given in divine acts is never complete. God must open the eyes of men continually to see the significance of what He does and has done. This is repeated in each generation, and as God opens men's eyes to see fresh light breaking forth from His Word, man's knowledge of divine things is rendered more and more complete and certain. The doctrine of the Trinity thus is the result of God's opening the eyes of men to see the theological significance of certain salvation acts performed by the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. It is not derived from definite propositions of Scripture, but represents "the conception of God involved in the Christian life of adopted sonship in Christ." In other words, the Church argues the doctrine of the Trinity because definite redemptive actions have been accomplished by a God who is three in Persons. To put it in different words: there is a doctrine of the Trinity because there has been experienced by followers of Christ a triune act of redemption. Traditional theology reverts the process and declares: "Scripture reveals to men the Triune God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, to whom man, lost in sin, owes his salvation." As the author denies the divine inspiration of Scripture, so also the Incarnation in the sense of traditional orthodoxy; for to him the Incarnation is but "the carrying out in history of the divine plan wherein God manifests His omnipotence by triumphing over the limitations prescribed by Himself in His creation of finite centers of freedom." The objective of the author's discussion is dogmatico-apologetic. He desires to declare, deepen, and defend the Christian faith as this is held in the church creeds. But if the doctrine of the Trinity (and that includes all other doctrines) rests upon no surer ground than man's conception of God's activity in history, who will guarantee to anyone that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is, after all, correct? If each generation must see fresh light breaking forth from God's redemptive activity, may not, after all, the Modernist be right in maintaining that the orthodox Christian experience of a Triune God is altogether wrong, in other words, that there is no Trinity, no redemption by Christ, no sanctification by the Holy Ghost, indeed, no hell and sin from which to redeem? Philosophy certainly will not convince the doubter and gainsayer, as the author himself admits when he says that "if we cannot fully understand the divine unity, it is more philosophical to acknowledge the mystery than to ignore, distort, or explain away any of the evidence." Such argumentation will get us nowhere. We dare not base the doctrine of the Trinity on experience, reason, or empirical evidence, but it must be based on the persuasive witness of the divine word, which not only tells us that God has revealed Himself by definite acts in history, but also that He has given us

a divine, infallible book of truth in which He Himself tells us very definitely that there is a Triune God, who is the Author of our salvation. As a thorough study in philosophical apologetics Dr. Hodgson's book is most interesting; as a means of convincing men of the truth of the Trinity it is bound to fail, just because it so thoroughly rationalizes this greatest of all mysteries of faith. The theologian who wishes to help our confused age, must go the whole way back to orthodoxy; he dare not stop at any half-way station where conceited reason still dictates the theological method.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

The Creative Delivery of Sermons. By Robert White Kirkpatrick. Published by The Macmillan Company, New York. 235 pages, 5¼×7¾. \$2.50.

This is a book on sermon delivery which is written along unusual lines. It emphasizes the great importance of a good delivery in the pulpit. The author maintains that this part of the minister's equipment has in many cases been greatly neglected in his courses given at the theological seminary. Dr. Sockman, who has written a Foreword, says, "The mental machinery may turn, the moral fervor may surge through the speaker, but if the spark fails to flash between pulpit and pew, the power is wasted. . . . Theological seminaries have treated sermon delivery as a far too subordinate subject." (P.ix.) The author of the book puts it in these words: "During each year in the ministry the average minister buys, or borrows from some library, book after book in an effort to increase the effectiveness of his preaching. Yet he seldom, if ever, reads even one volume that is intended to help him convey his sermon to the hearers. . . . This need is accentuated by the fact that the radio and the screen have thoroughly familiarized the person in the pew with what good speaking is." (Pp.2-3.) Therefore the author in his own Preface says: "The aim of this approach is to enable the minister intelligently and confidently to employ the best possible means of attaining and maintaining a vital experience of the truths presented in a particular sermon and of effectively conveying them to others in preaching. Worded differently, the aim is at the moment of preaching to provide the Holy Spirit with as sensitive and as effective an instrument as possible." (P.xiii.) Perhaps the following paragraphs taken from chapter XI will sum up what the author attempts to teach: "The minister's aim in sermon delivery is through the utilization of every capacity of his personality that can aid, and through the use of only those capacities in only that degree, to lead his hearers into such an awareness of the reality of the sermon as will cause them to bring their thought, feeling, and life into accord with the divine will as it is expressed in the sermon. Creative preaching enables the minister intelligently and efficiently to employ his powers toward achieving this goal. By insisting during preparation on the imaginative, pantomimic, and vocal re-creation of the content and by insisting during delivery on the imaginative re-creation of the content for the hearer, including the employment of appropriate muscle tensions even though they be covert, there is the strongest likelihood in creative preaching that every helpful capacity of the minister's personality will be enlisted in ex-

periencing and conveying the sermon. Furthermore, since the consciously realized purpose of such preaching is for the benefit of the hearer, it is equally probable that the minister will not employ any capacities that have no place in conveying the sermon as winningly as possible." (P. 217 f.)

In order fully to understand how the author would accomplish his purpose for an effective pulpit delivery, one must read and *study* his book. Many a preacher who thinks that his pulpit delivery is satisfactory may find that he has yet much to learn. The fact remains that the best sermon will not well serve its purpose if not well delivered.

J. H. C. FRITZ

The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Hans Meyer. Translated by Rev. Frederic Eckhoff. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo. 581 pages, 5¾×8¾. \$5.00.

There are numerous reasons why Meyer-Eckhoff's *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* should be cordially welcomed and eagerly read also by Protestant scholars who are interested in the subject which it treats. As everyone knows, Thomas Aquinas is the theologian *par excellence* of the Roman Catholic Church, and without at least some knowledge of the fundamentals of his thought Roman Catholic theology remains unintelligible. To understand the principles underlying the *Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, the Protestant theologian must go back to the "Prince of Scholastic Theologians," the *Doctor Angelicus* of Scholasticism, whose *Summa Theologiae* is still the standard authority in Roman Catholicism, he having been proclaimed *Doctor Ecclesiae* in 1567. Hans Meyer's thorough and painstaking work, excellently translated by Rev. Frederic Eckhoff, is of course too difficult for beginners, who, unacquainted with the nature and methodology of Scholasticism, require a shorter manual, in which a brief analysis is offered of the essentials of Medieval Thomism. For the scholar who wishes to acquaint himself with Thomistic doctrine in detail a much larger work is needed, as, for example (to mention an older, but still valuable work), Werner's *Der heilige Thomas von Aquino* (3 vols., Ratisbon, 1858—59). But Meyer-Eckhoff's work fills the gap between the introductory compend and the exhaustive reference work with its technical minutiae, which are apt to deter the beginner from the study of so complex a subject. It is neither too elementary nor too exhaustive, but offers a splendid overview of the essence and objective of Thomistic philosophy. In addition, it holds to such essentials as are of universal interest and presents these in clear and simple language, which also such readers can easily grasp as are not adept in philosophical terminology. The English translation has been done remarkably well, in fact so much so that usually the reader hardly notices the fact that he is dealing with a rendition. It does not require much study of the book to understand why Meyer's original work, which appeared in 1938, should now be made accessible to so many more students by presenting it in English. The fact that the book is written by a Catholic author does not detract from its value, for while the writer did his work with a sympathetic understanding and deep appreciation of the Angelic Doctor, he nevertheless reserved for himself the right of independent thinking and criticizes Thomistic

thought in many places, frequently, as it appears to the reviewer, too severely, as, for example, when he condemns Aquinas' views of the social status of woman. The volume will greatly aid such as endeavor to ascertain what Thomism proper and Neo-Thomism have in common and in what respects they differ, though in general the *nexus indivulsus* between Medieval Thomism and Neo-Thomism is apparent. The author certainly is justified when he speaks of "the mental acrobatics" of which certain Neo-Thomists are guilty (p.527). As the reader peruses the book, he is reminded time and again that it is only with certain limitations that one may speak of a "philosophy" of Thomas Aquinas. His philosophy, in fact, is his theology, and vice versa. The clear line of demarcation which orthodox Protestantism draws between philosophy and theology is missing in orthodox Scholasticism, which may be interpreted as an endeavor to solve "the problem of faith and science, of reason and supernatural revelation" (p.5). However, in using reason "as an instrument of progress in theological knowledge" (p.45), theology becomes a species of *Religionsphilosophie*, and the confusion following with regard to such fundamentals as sin and grace, the human soul and redemption, etc., explains Luther's seemingly very severe judgment: "St. Thomas, as all Thomists and all Scholastic teachers, never possessed the right and true understanding of even only one chapter of Scripture" (St. L. ed., IV, 1305); or: "Thomas and the Summists have never written anything else than their stammerings" (St. L. ed., VI, 398). As a determined Scripture theologian, accepting the Bible as the only and supreme authority of divine truth, and its several doctrinal teachings as pure articles of faith, with which reason must not tamper, the great Reformer simply could not bear the *credo ut intelligam* principle of the Medievalists. Contrary to the opinion of many Protestant scholars that Thomas Aquinas was a pure Aristotelian, he, as the author shows, was influenced in his thinking also by pagan Neo-Platonism, though also here he was as ready to reject what he regarded as wrong as when he dealt with pagan Aristotelianism. Ultimately it was the influence of Christian Augustinianism which made Thomas the accepted teacher of the Roman Catholic Church (p.20 f.). The book treats, in its first part, the background of Thomistic thought; historical influences; his contribution to philosophy; St. Thomas the man. The second part is devoted to the structure of reality, with four great sections: The Structure of Individual Things; the Hierarchy of the Forms of Being; the Origin and Corruption of Things; and, finally, Order in the Universe. Next follows an evaluation of the work of Thomas and his influence on philosophy in later times. An "Appendix" offers the most important dates of his life and a chronological list of his works. As one considers that Thomas Aquinas died when he was less than fifty years old, one marvels both at his intellectual endowments and the great amount of work which he did in the short span of his crowded life. The reviewer knows of no other work of its compass on Thomas Aquinas which in general is quite so helpful to the average student of medieval thought as this new volume by Meyer-Eckhoff, and he cordially recommends it for critical study to all who are interested in Thomistic philosophy.

JOHN THEODORE MUELLER

Gloria in Excelsis Deo. By Walter Wismar. Concordia Publishing House. 47 pages. 25 cents.

This collection, compiled by Cantor Wismar of Holy Cross Church, St. Louis, includes choir pieces for Advent, Christmas, New Year's Eve, New Year, and Epiphany. All are in three-part harmony, suitable for children's, girls', and adult female voices. The text is limited to three stanzas, as a rule. The eminent cantor has here carefully selected thirty-four numbers from the wealth of hymns and carols available for these seasons. The arrangements are simple enough for the average choir. Our choirmasters, who must nowadays depend largely on children's and female voices for their church choirs, will no doubt welcome this fine little volume. We heartily recommend it to them.

W. G. POLACK

The Music for the Liturgy of the Lutheran Hymnal. Authorized by the Intersynodical Committee on Hymnology and Liturgics for the Synodical Conference of North America. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1944. 124 pages, 6½×9. Various bindings. \$3.00.

The Graduals for the Church Year. (Including Sentences for the Seasons and Sequence Hymns.) Prepared for the Intersynodical Committee on Hymnology and Liturgics for the Synodical Conference of North America by Erwin Kurth and Walter E. Buszin. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1944. 103 pages, 7×10¼. \$1.25.

Sacred Music for Choir and Organ. Catalog of Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., 1944. 91 pages, 7½×10¼.

The Music for the Liturgy provides the six orders of service of the *Lutheran Hymnal*, with musical settings for those items of the service not scored in the latter. The Introit is set to a modified Gregorian tone. A chant is suggested for the collects, although not for the lections. The Creeds are given an accompaniment of which the monotone of the chant is the treble, or leading tone, contrary to the previous settings. The Sentences for the Seasons are scored individually. An alternate form for the chanting of the Lord's Prayer and the Words of Institution in the Communion Service is characterized by a predominantly minor mode.

A simple setting for the chanting of the Gradual is given in the *Music for the Liturgy*. *The Graduals of the Church Year* provides a large variety of settings for the graduals from season to season. These settings range from Gregorian, especially for the Alleluias of the festivals, through early and newer Anglican, to modern chants, some prepared especially for this volume. Reactions to the choices will probably vary widely. This reviewer found the variety and dignity quite acceptable. Setting the Gradual for the Festival of the Reformation to the tune of *A Mighty Fortress* may seem naive to some. The introduction to the work is especially valuable. Together with the compilation of the chants it should serve to enrich the service properly. This reviewer finds the custom of the pastor's reading the Gradual liturgically and artistically unsatisfying; to replace the spoken Gradual

with a hymn, after the precedent of Luther's *Deutsche Messe*, or to assign it to a competent chanting group seems preferable. This work suggests principles and materials.

Concordia's Catalog of Sacred Music is more than a sales device. It climaxes a long series of publications, including those of the Choral Union of the Walther League, and provides authoritative suggestions for every church need from the lists of many publishers.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

Student Manual of Speech Correction. Richard R. Hutcheson and Klovla McKennon Tilley. Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company. 143 pages. 5×7½. \$2.50.

Mr. Hutcheson is a speech clinician associated with a number of colleges in the Washington, D. C., area. Mrs. Tilley is associated with him in clinical work. The book is designed to provide introductory points of view and suggestions for therapy to the clinician at work particularly with children. The work travels a middle-of-the-road course between current theories on stuttering and makes much of the mental-image theory of articulation. The introductory chapters are good, but presuppose considerable acquaintance with the physiology of speech. Also the exercises and suggestions for therapy are useful, but imply the use of much supplementary material. In view of the partial character of the work and the price of equivalent books on the market the price of this book is very high.

RICHARD R. CAEMMERER

A Manual of Ecclesiology. By H. E. Dana. Second Edition Revised in Collaboration with L. M. Sipes. Central Seminary Press, Kansas City, Kans. 1944. 358 pages, 5½×8. \$2.00.

This volume, useful for all who wish to study the doctrine of the Church and Baptist church polity, is written from the Biblical conservative point of view. The authors (we use the plural although it is chiefly Professor Dana who has written the book even in its present edition) endeavor to fix the exact meaning of *ἐκκλησία* in the New Testament—a much-discussed term, as our readers are aware. The various passages where the word occurs are analyzed, and their bearing on the subject is pointed out. The conclusion reached is that in the great majority of instances where *ἐκκλησία* is employed it has a local meaning—a congregation, a community of Christians residing at a given place. On the question concerning which there was a slight difference of opinion between Dr. Walther and Dr. Pieper (Walther holding that a term like "the church at Corinth," 1 Cor. 1:2, designated all who professed to be members of the church at Corinth, while Pieper believed that the term was meant to refer to real believers only), the authors hold the same view as Dr. Walther. When speaking of the church at large, the authors oppose the Episcopal system of church organization and the "connectional system," found, for instance, with the Presbyterians and with the Lutherans in those countries where the State exercises some control of the Church. In our country, so they say, synods take the place of the State in governing the Lutheran churches. The authors, we fear, do not fully understand the Lutheran system at this point.

They apparently are not aware of it that of our synods we hold they are not *jure divino* but *jure humano*, and their function is advisory. Quite valuable is the section which deals with the various union movements which during the last forty or fifty years have been parading prominently on the ecclesiastical stage. Naturally, merely the efforts to unite denominations, not intradenominational attempts, are treated.

At many places the reviewer had to dissent from the view expressed. This was true, of course, especially in the second part ("Principles of Church Polity"), in the sections where the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, and their significance were surveyed. The authors defend, as was to be expected, the well-known Baptist positions on these heads. Among the things that jar the Lutheran reader is the use of the words "redeem" and "redemption" in a sentence like this one, "The Church is the divinely ordained agency of redemption" (p. 205). For us, who hold it a precious truth that Christ completed the work of redemption on the cross, the use just mentioned is disconcerting, to put it mildly. The book will render an important service to all those of our readers who desire to make a special study of the word *ἐκκλησία*, and for that reason we are happy that the work has appeared. Professor Dana, we ought to add, is well known for the excellent *Grammar for the Greek New Testament* which he together with Professor Mantey gave to theologians and for his text on the New Testament world.

W. ARNDT

Jesus the Christ. By Charles Cullen. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press, Nashville. 88 pages. \$2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House.

Charles Cullen, graduate of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts and winner of the Cresson European Scholarship after several periods of study abroad, has achieved some renown in our country as an illustrator. His work has appeared in a number of important magazines, and he has illustrated a number of volumes of poetry. In this book he presents the product of years of work, fulfilling a lifelong ambition to illustrate the life of our Lord. The drawings are all in black and white. There are forty in all. Each one illustrates an outstanding event in Christ's life. Opposite each drawing is given the text of the story illustrated, in the words of the King James Version. The style of the artist is truly modern in its chasteness and simplicity, yet with an intensity of feeling that is at times startling. We highly recommend this volume to clergy and laity alike. To have this book is to peruse it often and to treasure it the more as time goes by.

W. G. POLACK

BOOKS RECEIVED

From Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo.

God So Loved the World. A Children's Christmas Service by H. W. Gockel and E. J. Saleska. 20 pages, 8¼×5½. Price: single copy, 5 cents, postpaid; dozen, 50 cents, and postage; one hundred, \$3.50, and postage.

All My Heart This Night Rejoices. A Children's Christmas Service by Gervasius W. Fischer. 20 pages, 8¼×5½. Price: same as above.